

Pindar's *Paeans*



A Reading of the Fragments
with a Survey of the Genre

IAN RUTHERFORD

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogotá Buenos Aires Calcutta
Cape Town Chennai Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul
Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai
Nairobi Paris São Paulo Shanghai Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw
and associated companies in Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Ian Rutherford 2001

First published 2001

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

ISBN 0-19-814381-8

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Typeset by John Was, Oxford
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
Biddles Ltd., Guildford and King's Lynn

To the memory of my mother

ἀντηχήσατε παιᾶνα τῷ κάτωθεν ἀσπόνδῳ θεῷ

Preface

SMALL fragments can be enough to illustrate the brilliance of Pindar's art, and even among the broken columns of his *Paeans* the reader will find beautiful poetry. At the same time, the strongest justification for the study of these songs would probably not be that they represent his technique at its finest; the artistry of the *Epinikia* is more accomplished, and the signs are that for Pindar the supreme inspiration was provided by the great athletic contests. The reason the *Paeans* have a legitimate claim on our attention is rather that they are the best surviving classical examples of a species of song which we know to have been important in the song-dance culture of Greece in the fifth century BC. It is also a genre in which Pindar was believed to have excelled, if this can be inferred from the tradition that he was awarded heroic honours at Delphi after his death, and that his descendants enjoyed preferential treatment at the Delphic Theoxenia.

Major fragments of the book of *Paeans* included in the Hellenistic edition of Pindar were published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908. Since then other papyri have extended our knowledge of the book, allowing in particular the partial reconstruction of the important songs B2 and C2. The new papyri have also yielded many fragments of uncertain Hellenistic classification, some of which may come from *Paeans*. We probably now have at least a rough idea of the contents of something approaching half of the Hellenistic edition of the *Paeans*.

What I offer here is a general interpretation of Pindar's articulation of the genre, drawing on a wide range of sources and approaches that might illuminate it. The principal aims are to build up a picture of the genre as a whole, to explore the performance context and the religious background of the surviving fragments of the Pindaric *Paeans*, to compare and contrast the evidence of Pindar's *Paeans* with a model of the *παίαν* built up from other sources, to figure out what we can know about how they were arranged in the Hellenistic edition, and to make progress in determining the genre of

songs that fragments come from in cases where this is uncertain. The larger part of this book is taken up with close studies of fragments that are known or have been supposed to come from *Paeans*. I must acknowledge an enormous debt to scholars who have illuminated the nature of the evidence, particularly to B. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. Lobel, who were responsible for the first editions of most of the fragments; to B. Snell and H. Maehler, whose edition of the fragments of Pindar remains the standard work; and to S. Radt, whose edition of and commentary on the two best-preserved *Paeans* have been of great use to me. A conspicuous innovation in my treatment of the material is that I have arranged the fragments in a new way, classifying them into eight groups (A to H), along with two supplements (S and Z). This classification I think better represents the nature of the material than any arrangement of them that has appeared hitherto.

The logical starting-point for a study of this sort is a general overview of the *παίαν*, and this I have tried to provide in the first part of the introduction, setting out to survey the *παίαν* from the points of view of function, performance, and form, and drawing attention to some special features of the genre, such as its use in tragedy. (The important study of the genre by Käppel became available to me only when my book was already virtually complete, but I have tried to incorporate references to it where I could.) This survey forms the background to the second chapter of the introduction, which is concerned specifically with Pindar's articulation of the genre and the reconstruction of the Hellenistic edition, as they appear against the background of the first section. Despite the risk of circularity, I was unable to make the general survey completely free of any reference to the evidence from Pindar's *Paeans*, which after all constitute such an important part of the evidence for the *παίαν* in the fifth century BC, but I have tried as far as possible to ground it on independent evidence.

No one could have been more fortunate than I in the excellent conditions of research I enjoyed both at Trinity College, Oxford, and at Harvard; in particular I would like to acknowledge grants from Harvard's Clark Fund and James Loeb Fund, and to the Classics Department at Harvard for allowing me generous use of their laser printers. Generous also was the high level of encouragement and advice on particular problems I have received from many specialists

and colleagues; I would like in particular to acknowledge a special debt to a number of friends and colleagues who read the whole manuscript at some stage: G. B. D'Alessio, Silvia Barbantani, Paola Ceccarelli, Bruno Currie, Julia Griffin, Barbara Kowalzig, Jane Lightfoot, Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, John Morgan, Gregory Nagy, René Nünlist, Dirk Obbink, William Race, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, Eva Stehle, Calvert Watkins, and my copy-editor John Waś; also for particular points to many friends, among them Egbert Bakker, Patricia Bochi, Deborah Boedekker, Francis Cairns, Maria Cannatà Fera, Revel Coles, Jerzy Danielewicz, Mary Depew, Malcolm Heath, Albert Henrichs, James Irvine, Lutz Käppel, Leslie Kurke, Mary Lefkowitz, Irad Malkin, Lena Mendoni, David Mitten, Fred Naiden, Peter Parsons, Nicholas Richardson, Scott Scullion, Charles Segal, Tonia Sharlach, Richard Thomas, and Father Vertanes of the Monastery of St Lazzaro, Venice. Their acumen and good will greatly enhanced the pleasure of writing the book.

In revising this book, I have stumbled upon many avenues of enquiry which it has not been possible to follow up in this format, and I am conscious that our understanding of the *παίαν* and other lyric genres is far from complete. These are exciting times for the study of Pindaric poetry and for the fragmentary genres in particular; it seems that more progress has been made in the last decade than in the century since the discovery of the papyri. I can only hope that my contribution will play a small part in the continuing dialogue of research and argument. *ὃς παίαν*.

I.R.

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	xii
----------------------	-----

PART I: Introduction

1. The <i>Παιάν</i> : A Survey of the Genre	3
2. Pindar's <i>Paeans</i>	137

PART II: The Fragments of Pindar's *Paeans*

Note on the Text	185
Fragments of Π ⁺ (Groups A–E)	189
Fragments Not from Π ⁺ (Groups F–H)	350

Supplements

S: Dubious <i>Paianes</i>	399
Z: Scraps Not from Π ⁺	433

<i>Metrical Appendix</i>	443
--------------------------	-----

<i>Repertory of Παιᾶνες by Poets Other than Pindar</i>	459
--	-----

<i>Concordance of Editions and Assignment Checklists</i>	467
--	-----

<i>Bibliography</i>	472
---------------------	-----

<i>Index of Greek Words</i>	513
-----------------------------	-----

<i>Index of Passages Cited</i>	516
--------------------------------	-----

<i>Index of Subjects</i>	536
--------------------------	-----

Abbreviations

<i>ABV</i>	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic Black-figure Vase-painters</i> (Oxford, 1956)
<i>Add</i> ²	T. H. Carpenter <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Beazley Addenda: Additional References to ABV, ARV², and Paralipomena</i> (Oxford, 1989)
<i>AG</i>	<i>Anthologia Graeca</i>
<i>ALG</i>	E. Diehl, <i>Anthologia Lyrica Graeca</i> ¹ (Leipzig, 1952)
<i>ARV</i> ²	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic Red-figure Vase-painters</i> , 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1963)
<i>ATL</i>	B. D. Merritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, <i>The Athenian Tribute Lists</i> (4 vols.; Boston, 1939–53)
<i>BMC</i>	B. V. Head, P. Gardner, and G. Hill, <i>A Catalogue of Coins in the British Museum</i> (29 vols.; London, 1873–1927)
<i>CA</i>	J. U. Powell, <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> (Oxford, 1925)
<i>CAF</i>	<i>Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta</i> , ed. T. Kock (4 vols.; Leipzig, 1880–8)
<i>CCSL</i>	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina (Turnholt, 1954–)
<i>CGF</i>	<i>Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , ed. G. Kaibel, i/1. <i>Dorensium Comoedia, Mimi, Phlyaces</i> (Berlin, 1899)
<i>CID</i>	<i>Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes</i> (3 vols. to date; Paris, 1977–)
<i>CPG</i>	<i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , ed. E. L. Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin (2 vols.; Göttingen, 1839–51)
<i>DÉLG</i>	P. Chantraine, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots</i> (4 vols.; Paris, 1968–80)
<i>DGEEP</i>	<i>Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora</i> , ed. E. Schwyzer (Hildesheim, 1923)
<i>DK</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> ⁷ , ed. H. Diels and W. Kranz (3 vols.; Berlin, 1954)
<i>Dr</i>	<i>Scholia in Pindarum</i> , ed. A. B. Drachmann (3 vols.; Leipzig, 1903–27)
<i>D schol.</i>	The D scholia on Homer's <i>Iliad</i> , collected in A. J. Laskaris, <i>Σχόλια παλαιὰ τῶν δοκίμων εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα</i> (Rome, 1517)
<i>EGen (A)</i>	<i>Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum</i> ,

- Etymologicum Magnum Auctum*, i (α-άμωσγέπως); ii (ἀνά-βώτορες), ed. F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras (Rome, 1976-)
- EGen* (ined) The rest of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* as reported from MSS
- EGud* (Stef) *Etymologicum Gudianum*, i (A-B); ii (βωμολόχ-—ζείαι), ed. A. de Stefani (2 vols.; Leipzig, 1909-26)
- EGud* (Sturz) *Etymologicum Graecae Linguae Gudianum*, ed. F. G. Sturz (Leipzig, 1818)
- EM* *Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford (Oxford, 1848)
- ÉPRO* *Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* (Leiden, 1961-)
- FD* *Fouilles de Delphes: FD ii/9: La Région nord du sanctuaire*, ed. J. Pouilloux (Paris, 1960); *FD iii/2: Trésor des Athéniens*, ed. G. Colin (Paris 1909-13)
- FGrH* *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby (3 vols.; Berlin and Leiden, 1923-58)
- FHG* *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. C. and T. Müller (5 vols.; Paris, 1843-70)
- GD (Musée)* *Guide de Delphes: Le Musée* (École Française d'Athènes, Sites et monuments, 6; Paris, 1991)
- GD (Site)* J.-F. Bommelaer and D. Laroché, *Guide de Delphes: Le Site* (École Française d'Athènes, Sites et monuments, 7; Paris, 1991)
- GDRK* *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, ed. E. Heitsch (2 vols.; Abhandl. Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl. I, 3rd ser., 49; 1961-4)
- GGM* *Geographici Graeci Minores*, ed. C. Müller (2 vols.; Paris, 1855-61)
- GH* B. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *POxy v* (London, 1908)
- Hesychius (Latte) *Hesychii Lexicon* [A-O only], ed. K. Latte (2 vols.; Copenhagen, 1953-)
- Hesychius (Schmidt) *Hesychii Lexicon*, ed. M. Schmidt (5 vols.; Jena, 1858-68)
- HGM* *Historici Graeci Minores*, ed. L. Dindorf (2 vols.; Leipzig, 1870-1)
- Hunt A. S. Hunt in B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *POxy xv* (London, 1922)
- IC* *Inscriptiones Creticae*, ed. M. Guarducci (4 vols.; Rome, 1935-50)
- ID* *Inscriptions de Délos*, ed. F. Durrbach, T. Reinach, P. Rous-sel, and A. Plassart (7 vols. to date; Paris, 1926-)
- IEG* *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*², ed. M. L. West (2 vols.; Oxford, 1989-92)

- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae* (12 vols.; Berlin, 1873–1981)
IG i² *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Antiores²*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1924)
IG i³ *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Antiores³*, ed. D. Lewis et al. (2 pts.; Berlin, 1981–94)
IG ii–iii² *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Posteriores²*, ed. J. Kirchner (3 pts.; Berlin, 1913–35)
IG iv *Inscriptiones Argolidis*, ed. M. Fraenkel (Berlin, 1902)
IG iv/1² *Inscriptiones Epidauri*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1929)
IG v *Inscriptiones Laconicae Messeniae Arcadiae*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1913)
IG xii *Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum* (9 vols.; Berlin, 1895–1915; suppl. 1939): *IG xii/1: Inscriptiones Rhodi, Chalcis, Carpathi cum Saro Casi*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1895); *IG xii/3: Inscriptiones Symes, Teuthussiae, Teli, Nisyri, Astupalaeae, Anaphes, Therae et Therasiae, Phogelandri, Cimoli, Meli*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1898); *IG xii/5: Inscriptiones Cycladum*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (2 pts.; Berlin 1903–9); *IG xii/7: Inscriptiones Amorgi et Insularum Vicinarum*, ed. J. Delamarre (Berlin, 1908); *IG xii/8: Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Thracici*, ed. C. Fredrich (Berlin, 1909)
IG xiv *Inscriptiones Italiae et Siciliae*, ed. G. Kaibel (Berlin, 1890)
IGLS *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, ed. L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, J.-P. Rey-Coquais, M. Sartre, and P.-L. Gatiér (vols. i–vii, xiii/1, xxi/3; Paris, 1911–86)
IG Rom *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*, ed. R. Cagnat et al. (4 vols.; Paris, 1911–27)
KN Linear B tablets from Knossos as coded in J. Chadwick, J. T. Killen, and J.-P. Olivier, *The Knossos Tablets: A Transliteration⁴* (Cambridge, 1974)
LÄ *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, ed. W. Helck and E. Otto (7 vols.; Wiesbaden, 1972–92)
LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, ed. L. Kahil (8 vols.; Munich, 1981–97)
Lobel Lobel (1961), q.v. in Bibliography
LSAM *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, ed. F. Sokolowski (Paris, 1955)
LSCG *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, ed. F. Sokolowski (Paris, 1969)
LSCGS *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Supplément*, ed. F. Sokolowski (Paris, 1962)
LSJ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon: A*

- New (9th) Edition by Sir H. Stuart Jones (Oxford, 1940); Supplement by E. A. Barber (Oxford, 1968)*
- Mae** *Pindarus*, ii. *Fragmenta, Indices*, ed. H. Maehler (Leipzig, 1989)
- MG** *Mythographi Graeci*, ed. R. Wagner, P. Sakolowski, E. Martini, A. Olivieri, and N. Festa (5 pts. only; Leipzig, 1894–1902)
- ML** R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, rev. edn. (Oxford, 1988)
- OF** *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, ed. O. Kern (Berlin, 1922)
- Para** J. D. Beazley, *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-figure Vase-painters and to Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* (Oxford, 1971)
- PBerol** *Papyri Berolinenses* [9767–16336 = Papyrussammlung der Staatl. Museen in Ost-Berlin; 21105–99 = Ägyptische Abteilung der Staatl. Museen West Berlin]
- PCG** *Poetae Comici Graeci*, ed. R. Kassel and C. Austin (Berlin, 1983–)
- PGM** *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*², ed. K. Preisendanz, E. Heitsch, and A. Henrichs (Stuttgart, 1974)
- PLF** *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, ed. E. Lobel and D. Page (Oxford, 1955)
- PLG** *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, ed. T. Bergk. *PLG*¹: *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*¹, ed. T. Bergk (Leipzig, 1843); *PLG*²: *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, ed. T. Bergk (Leipzig, 1853); *PLG*³: *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, ii. *Poetae Elegiaci et Iambographi*³, ed. T. Bergk (Leipzig, 1866); *PLG*⁴: *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, i. *Pindari Carmina*⁴, ed. T. Bergk (Leipzig, 1878), iii. *Poetae Melici*⁴ (Leipzig, 1882); *PLG*⁵: *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, ed. W. O. Schroeder, i. *Pindari Carmina*⁵ (Leipzig, 1900)
- PMG** *Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D. L. Page (Oxford, 1962)
- PMGF** *Poetarum Melicorum Fragmenta*, i, ed. M. Davies (Oxford, 1991)
- POxy** *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London, 1898–) [roman numerals refer to volumes of the series; arabic numerals refer to individual papyri]
- PSI** *Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto*, ed. G. Vitelli and M. Norsa (Florence, 1912–)
- Puech** Puech (1952), q.v. in Bibliography
- PY** E. L. Bennett and J.-P. Olivier, *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed* (Incunabula Graeca, 51; Rome, 1973)

R	Repertory (see pp. 459 ff.)
Radt	Radt (1958), q.v. in Bibliography
RE	<i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. A. Fr. von Pauly, rev. G. Wissowa <i>et al.</i> (Stuttgart, 1894–1980), referred to by half-volume
Schol. Ar.	<i>Scholia in Aristophanem</i> , ed. W. J. Koster (Göttingen, 1960–)
Schr	Schroeder
SEC	<i>Supplemento epigrafico cirenaico</i> , ed. G. Oliverio, G. Pugliese Carratelli, and D. Morelli (Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente, 24; Rome, 1962), 219–375
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> (Leiden, 1923–)
SGUA	F. Preisigke <i>et al.</i> , <i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten</i> (Strasburg, 1915–)
SH	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> , ed. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons (Oxford, 1983)
SIG ³	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> ³ , ed. G. Dittenberger and F. Hiller von Gaertringen (4 vols.; Leipzig, 1915–24)
SIG ⁴	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> ⁴ , ed. Wilhelm Dittenberger (repr. Hildesheim, 1960)
SLG	<i>Supplementum Lyricis Graecis</i> , ed. D. L. Page (Oxford, 1974)
Sn	<i>Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis</i> , ed. B. Snell (Leipzig, 1953; 1955 ² , 1959 ³ (pt. 1: <i>Epinicia</i>); 1964 ³ (pt. 2: <i>Fragmenta</i>), 1964 ³ (pt. 1: <i>Epinicia</i>))
SnMae	<i>Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis</i> ed. B. Snell, rev. H. Maehler, pt. 1: <i>Epinicia</i> ⁸ (Leipzig, 1987); pt. 2: <i>Fragmenta, Indices</i> ⁴ (Leipzig, 1975)
TGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , ed. A. Nauck (Leipzig, 1856 ¹ , 1889 ²)
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , ed. B. Snell, R. Kannicht, and S. Radt (Göttingen, 1971–)
Turyn	A. Turyn, <i>Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis</i> (Cracow, 1948; repr. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1952)
V	E.-M. Voigt
Wil	Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff; in apparatus = Wil (1922), q.v. in Bibliography

Other abbreviations generally follow the conventions of *L'Année philologique*. For metrical and editorial symbols used in the Greek texts see the Note on the Text at the start of Part II.

PART I
Introduction

I

The *Παιάν*: A Survey of the Genre

I. QUESTIONS OF GENRE

Ancient Greece can be described as a song-dance culture, in so far as the performance of song and dance (translating the Greek *μολπή*) enjoyed an importance many times greater than what we find in any industrialized Western society today, but comparable to the position it still holds in some surviving traditional societies.¹ The modern instinct would be to think of the performance of song and dance as serving the purpose of recreation and entertainment, expressing or reflecting the values of the community. But in ancient Greece it played a more central role, often functioning as symbolic social action through which members of a community enacted (and not merely expressed) key events and transitions. As such, it played a role in education, reinforcing society's values and transmitting them from one generation to the next. If song-dance seems to us to have a strong sacred element, that does not mean that it was bracketed off within a special sphere of social activity concerned with religion; rather, it reflects the important role that the sacred played in all aspects of Greek social life. Finally, song-dance was an activity in which everyone could theoretically share: although some performances were the prerogative of élite classes, and the business of specialist guilds, it seems likely that competence in song-dance was expected of every member of society, and that there were numerous events and occasions in civic life when anyone might have been called on to display it.

The number of song-dances (henceforth 'songs' for short) in circulation in the fifth century BC was also very great. In theory, a song-dance culture might have been content with the re-performance of a fixed canon of traditional songs, and in some parts of the Greek world, especially in Sparta, this seems to have been the custom. But in most places there was a demand (at least in the classical period) for an ever increasing repertory of new material. On the

¹ The concept of 'song-culture' is discussed by Herington (1985), 3 ff.

other hand, innovation took place within a fixed canon of genres, some sacred (e.g. the διθύραμβος, προσόδιον, ὑπόρχημα, ὕμνος, δαφνηφορικόν, ὠσχοφορικόν), others comparatively secular (the ἐπινίκιον, ἐγκώμιον, θρήνος, παρθένειον). The generic 'canon' is thus essentially a conservative factor, though it is itself not immune to change (and we seem to see some changes from the end of the fifth century BC).²

The meaning of 'genre' here is not transparent. To elucidate it, it will be helpful to make three points:

1. What songs have to have in common in order to be perceived as adhering to the same genre seems usually to be a shared function or shared performance scenario; formal features are much less important. This is clear from the names of the genres, which usually connote function or performance scenario, and also from what we can glean about them from secondary sources.³

2. In the fifth century BC genre seems to be largely a descriptive category, reflecting actual practice, whatever that might be. Genres are not yet ideal norms; the latter idea surfaces first in the *Laws*, where Plato laments the tendency of modern poets (perhaps tragedians of the late fifth century BC) to mix different lyric genres, ignoring strict generic models which would have kept them apart.⁴

3. At all times genre can be described both synchronically—in terms of features shared by songs perceived as belonging to a given genre, which distinguish them from songs perceived as belonging to other genres—and diachronically—in terms of adherence to inherited types. It should be stressed that in classical Greece the latter dimension is likely to have been particularly important. We know that by the fifth century BC the major period of παιάν-composition was already over. Classic examples of the genre had been composed by poets such as Thaletas of Gortyn, Tynnichus of Chalcis, and Xenocritus of Locri (for Pindar's *homage* to the last see G9). Thus, Simonides and Pindar, who were celebrated composers of παιάνες in the classical period—seem to come at the tail-end of a tradition which began many centuries earlier.⁵

In respect of points (1) and (2) a contrast suggests itself with the post-classical, Hellenistic approach to genre, which can be described as 'normative' and 'formal'. It is 'normative' in the sense that it shows a heightened interest in differences between genres,

² For these genres consult the index.

³ Nagy (1990); Käppel (1992b), 34 ff.

⁴ Plato, *Laws*, 700 ff; Käppel (1992b), 36 ff.

⁵ Käppel (1992b), 15 ff.

both in maintaining them and in deliberately crossing them in order to generate interesting literary effects. And it is 'formal' in that it shows an increased deployment of formal features to create an impression of belonging to a genre, without these features being motivated by function, in order to create a false impression of a particular performance scenario (e.g. Call. *Hymn* 5, the *Bath of Pallas*).⁶

However, as soon as one sets up this antithesis between classical and Hellenistic concepts of genre, it begins to deconstruct itself. Neither of these trends is absent in the generic economy of the fifth century BC. Many songs by Pindar and Bacchylides display a sensitivity to generic conventions, and in some cases even a sophisticated manipulation of them. A high level of generic control is also implied by many choral odes in Athenian tragedies. And many songs from this period imply a 'mimetic' recreation of a ritual performance scenario. However, both the 'normative' and 'formal' become more important in the Hellenistic period. Their increased importance is reflected in the practice of committing generic rules to writing, which seems to come in at about the same time.⁷

The difference between classical and Hellenistic conceptions of genre can be explained by the hypothesis that in the fifth century BC, performance of song is still closely tied to social and religious context, whereas by the Hellenistic period this linkage has been lost, both because society was undergoing a transformation (changes in the genre will be a knock-on effect), but also because some Hellenistic writers were operating in a world far removed spatially from the traditional performance centres.

The contrast between classical and Hellenistic concepts of genre is of fundamental importance for the arguments of this book. My principal interest is in elucidating what was understood by the word *παιάν* in the classical period. But the Hellenistic concept cannot be ignored either, because it was the Alexandrian critics who arranged the songs of Pindar into generic categories, so that much of the primary evidence for the genre comes to us through a Hellenistic

⁶ Hellenistic theories of genre are summarized by Rossi (1971); Cameron (1995), 146–8; for *μίμησις* of performance scenario see further §20.

⁷ Sophisticated manipulation of generic convention in Pindar: §18c; in Bacchylides: §8c. Choral odes in Athenian tragedies: §10. 'Mimetic' recreation of ritual performance scenario: §20. Practice of committing generic rules to writing: contrast the claim of Rossi (1971), that all genres already had a written specification in the classical period.

filter. It is vital at all times to bear in mind that a song that was regarded as a *παιάν* in the fifth century BC need not have been classed as one by the Hellenistic critics (and vice versa). To avoid ambiguity, I designate a song assigned to the genre by a Hellenistic critic as a *Paian*, reserving the Greek *παιάν* for the classical concept. (I observe an analogous distinction for other genres also.) Most songs classified as *Paianes* would have been regarded as *παιάνες* at the time of their composition, and most *παιάνες* ended up being labelled *Paianes* in Hellenistic eidography. But there are exceptions to both generalizations.

For the concept in the fifth century BC two sources are available: descriptions of *παιάνες* in secondary sources, and surviving instances of the genre (i.e. 'primary sources'). Neither source is without its drawbacks: descriptions of the *παιάν* can provide evidence about function and performance scenario, but usually tell us nothing about formal features. There is also another problem: a parallel phenomenon to the *παιάν*-song is the *παιάν*-cry, an exclamation of the form *ἦ παιάν* (or similar) used with similar functions and on similar occasions; since both song and cry can be denoted by the same vocabulary (particularly the verb *παιανίζω*), secondary sources sometimes do not allow us to determine whether we are dealing with the song or the cry.⁸ Finally, secondary sources may sometimes misrepresent and distort the conditions of performance of *παιάνες*.⁹ In the case of primary sources, we are usually dependent on a judgement by a scholar (ancient or modern) to the effect that the song is a *παιάν*; furthermore, there is a risk that the primary material may not provide an even cross-section of classical *παιάνες*, since most of the surviving examples are highly literary compositions, whereas the simple or subliterate *παιάνες* that probably existed in large numbers are almost entirely unrepresented.¹⁰

Despite the limitations of the sources, enough information is available to allow us to construct a general model. It seems likely that the central idea behind any paeanic song-dance performance was that of an address or appeal to a deity under the title 'Paian' (interpreted as 'Healer'), usually identified with Apollo. The performers were usually groups of men, often young men of military age, singing and dancing in disciplined *χοροί*. The primary asso-

⁸ See pp. 21–2.

⁹ See in particular the representation of *παιάνες* in tragedy, discussed in §§10–11.

¹⁰ For complex and simple types see pp. 73–4.

ciations of paeanic song-dance performance are with the safety of the polis, with healing, and with controlled celebration; there is a clear contrast with the chthonic dirge (*παιᾶνες* are almost always excluded from the realm of the dead) and with the much wilder and subversive Dionysiac *διθύραμβος*.¹¹

The performance scenarios which hosted such paeanic song-dance performances were very diverse. They can be organized into three classes. One class is negative, the *παιάν* functioning as a prayer to avert some perceived evil. The paradigm case here would be the apotropaic *παιάν*, but I would also group here *παιᾶνες* that were used for purification from plague and *παιᾶνες* sung to promote healing. A second class of contexts is positive. The paradigm case here is that of a victory *παιάν*, but the *παιάν* was also used more generally as an expression of celebration, for example at weddings. This type may have originated as a prayer to a deity for continued good fortune which evolved into an expression of joy. A third class comprises contexts which could be thought of as incorporating elements of the first and second classes in our model, and in a sense holding an intermediate position between them. Thus, a *παιάν* sung at a *συμπόσιον* could be interpreted both as an apotropaic prayer and as an expression of celebration (*συμπόσιον-παιᾶνες* with both functions are mentioned by Xenophon),¹² but is usually not exclusively one or the other. The use of the *παιάν* in cult—principally as a hymn to Apollo, but also as a form of ritually correct utterance (*εὐφημία*) accompanying sacrifice—may belong in the intermediate category, as does the performance of *παιᾶνες* by *χοροί* visiting sanctuaries of Apollo. Finally, the singing of the *παιάν* by armies before battle can be added to the intermediate category, since it is both a positive song in which the army expresses its solidarity, but also an apotropaic prayer to avert the real danger of defeat in battle. The scope is surprisingly wide (the only other genre that comes near is the *ἔλεγχος*, which was used in positive symposiastic contexts but also in negative contexts such as mourning).¹³

This sketch does not provide an exhaustive account of the functions of the genre. A further dimension is that the performance of song in a traditional society such as that of archaic and classical

¹¹ The *παιάν* and Apollo: §§2, 4. Performance: §6. Contrast with other genres: §8c.

¹² *Hell.* 4. 7. 4: Agesipolis and the Spartans sang 'the *παιάν* concerning Poseidon' when an earthquake interrupted their meal; *Hell.* 7. 2. 23: the Phliasians sang a victory *παιάν* at dinner.

¹³ See Bowie (1986).

Greece is likely to have had broader social effects, such as the reinforcement of social structures or (in cases where the participants were young) the transmission of values from one generation to the next (something like 'initiation').¹⁴

That not all these contexts in fact accommodated the developed, artistic *παιάν*-song, and that the latter was confined to religious ceremonies of various sorts, is the conclusion of Harvey in an important article on lyric genres. Where our sources report that *παιᾶνες* were performed on other occasions (he argues), the reference might just as well be to short prayers containing (perhaps) an invocation to a deity, a request, and a *παιάν*-cry, and lacking the structural complexity that we find in the developed, artistic *παιάν*-song.¹⁵ Although I should not want to deny the term and category 'song' even to the simpler type, Harvey's point is a useful one, and we may even take it a stage further: since similar terminology is used for *παιάν*-song and *παιάν*-cry, apparent references to the performance of *παιᾶνες* may in fact be to the utterance of *παιάν*-cries.

However, while it is true that most of the surviving *παιάν*-songs were performed in the context of cult, some of these also gesture towards other functions, such as the apotropaic *παιάν* and the pre-battle *παιάν* (this sort of overlapping of functions seems to be characteristic of the *παιάν*). Furthermore, developed *παιάν*-songs seem at least sometimes to have been performed at the *συμπόσιον*, and some evidence suggests that developed *παιάν*-songs were sometimes sung for the purpose of celebration or to avert perceived evils. Only in the case of the wedding *παιάν* is there no evidence for anything more elaborate than a simple *παιάν*-cry, but even in that case the general conceptual similarity between *παιάν*-cry and *παιάν*-songs forbids us to rule out the possibility that *παιάν*-songs might have been performed also.¹⁶

One of the reasons that the broad range of occasions and functions of *παιάν*-performance has been underestimated may be that modern scholars have insufficiently appreciated the pervasive importance of song and song-dance in Greek society, where elaborate choral performances would have taken place on occasions that from the

¹⁴ See pp. 62–3.

¹⁵ Harvey (1955), 172: 'any discussion of the *παιάν* as an art-form must be disencumbered of references to martial paeans, sympotic paeans and so forth.'

¹⁶ Combination of functions in cult: see on A1, D2. Complexity of functions at the *συμπόσιον*: p. 52; in general §11. Developed *παιάν*-songs at the *συμπόσιον*: §5f; in celebration: §5d; apotropaic: §5a; the wedding *παιάν*: §5h.

point of view of a modern Western society would be perceived as unsuitable for them, e.g. before battle or at the *συνπόσιον*. One could go as far as to say that some such occasions would actually have been constituted by the performance of song or song-dance. It would thus be a methodological mistake to argue from the perceived incongruity of the context that only the minimal performance of a *παιάν*-cry is likely to have taken place.

The overall picture is unfocused: numerous performance scenarios, a strong tendency towards choral performance, the formal feature of the *παιάν*-refrain. The concept seems so nebulous that it could be argued that we are not dealing with a single genre at all. Specifically, two problems might be fixed upon:

1. The problem of coherence. Given that the range of functions and contexts is so wide, we should perhaps think not of a single type of song, but of a collection of homonymous types. (A similar problem arises with the term *διθύραμβος*, which can refer to either a type of song in honour of Dionysus or a type of narrative in which Dionysus has no regular part.) However, I believe that this problem is a matter of perception. It seems serious only if we place more emphasis on the differences than on underlying common elements of performance and function, particularly the creation of a sense of political solidarity among male performers, and a common ethos of controlled celebration which characterizes all performances of the *παιάν* and distinguishes it from other genres. (In §8c I explore this issue further.)

2. The problem of distinctiveness *vis-à-vis* other lyric genres. On the grounds that ancient (usually Hellenistic) critics seem themselves sometimes to have been in doubt about whether or not a song was a *παιάν*, it might be argued that we are in no position to assert that the *παιάν* is distinct from other lyric genres. I return to this problem in §9, showing that Hellenistic eidographic uncertainties arose from two factors—the difficulty of inferring function or circumstances of performance from texts alone, and the fact that in the fifth century BC lyric genres were not always wholly distinct from each other—but suggesting that these factors are fairly marginal, and should not seriously undermine the concept of a largely independent *παιάν*-genre.

All this is by way of defending the hypothesis that for Greeks of

the fifth century BC the *παιάν* was a relatively discrete and relatively unified concept. At the same time, however, the genre is characterized by a certain obstinate ambivalence of scope and significance. Part of this is local variation. Part is historical development (e.g. the development of the practice of singing *παιᾶνες* to important men, which takes off in the fourth century BC). Another part is self-conscious artistic exploration. This begins with the tragedians in the fifth century BC, who explore the relationship between the *παιάν* and the chthonic, and allude simultaneously to the positive and negative sides of the *παιάν*. From the fourth century BC we start to find individual songs that push the limits of the genre, for example Philodamus' *παιάν* to Dionysus. Such extensions and adaptations of the basic model of the genre will be discussed in §§10–12.

To fill out this picture, I now deal with a number of aspects of the *παιάν* in greater depth.

2. GENERIC ARCHAEOLOGY

There are two approaches to the question of the origin of the genre. The first would involve looking at the early development of the types of song that qualified as *παιᾶνες* in the classical period. The second consists of looking at the prehistory of the designation *παιάν* itself.

To begin with the first approach, almost all the types of song regarded as *παιᾶνες* in antiquity could be very old, and most of them existed in other cultures also, both Indo-European ones and non-Indo-European cultures of the Mediterranean and Near East. To mention only a few examples: the ancient Egyptians had highly developed hymns and prayers, including a particularly large repertoire in honour of the sun-deity Atum-Re (cf. Pindar, A1); the Sumerians had hymns in honour of their temples (cf. Pindar, B2); the Ancient Indian *Atharvaveda* includes charms against various ills and songs to be sung before battle; from the reign of the Hittite king Mursilis II (fourteenth century BC) comes a purificatory prayer for the cessation of plague; and the practice of performing song-dance in the context of battle is known from native African peoples, e.g. the battle-songs of the Nilotic Dinka, and a song beginning with an invocation to the deity Khvum sung before battle by the Gabon pygmies; the practice of performing song in the context of pilgrimage is attested in many cultures, e.g. in poetry from

Tamilnadu in southern India. A full survey of comparable material in other cultures would be almost limitless.¹

Hence, it is more practicable to limit ourselves to exploring the early development of songs known as *παιᾶνες* (the second approach). The name of the genre presents itself in several dialectal forms: although *παιάν* is the most common, we also find *παιήων* (epic and poetic), *πάων* (Aeolic), and *παιών* (Attic).² The same word is used as a title for Apollo (usually a substitute for his name rather than a true epithet), and also as a title or epithet for associated deities such as Asclepius.³ It is probably not identical with the anthroponym *Παίων*, -ονος.⁴ In its application to deities *παιάν* means 'healer', and it can have this sense independently of application to any deity.⁵ In Homer and early Greek poetry *Παιήων* is a healer god, distinct from Apollo.⁶ The Linear B tablets from Knossos preserve a form *paia-wonei*, the dative of *paiawon*, who must be a precursor of Homer's

¹ Egyptian hymns are analysed and translated by Assmann (1975). For Sumerian temple hymns see Sjöberg, Bergmann, and Gragg (1969). Almost every poem in the *Atharvaveda* is a charm of some sort; some pre-battle charms are 1. 19, 3. 1, 3. 2, 6. 97, 6. 98, 11. 9, 11. 10, 5. 20, and 5. 21. The Hittite plague hymn is edited and translated by Lebrun (1980), 192 ff.; for African war-poems in general see Finnegan (1970), 206 ff.; on the song of the Gabon pygmies see Bowra (1961b), 125, citing from Trilles (1931), 79; for the Dinga see Deng (1973), 202 ff. Tamil pilgrim songs are discussed by Peterson (1982).

² *παιήων* in e.g. Pind. D6. 122; *πάων* in Sappho 44. 32V, though there is an alternative Aeolic form *παιαον* at SLG 291, generally assigned to Sappho or Alcaeus; for the Attic form *παιών* see Wackernagel (1925), 61 ff. (=1953-79), 869 ff.; Forssman (1966), 151-2; the exception is the Attic deme 'Paiania', discussed in Cromey (1978). In general Nagy (1974), 135-6; Cromey (1978), 63 n. 4. As a metrical term (pp. 77-9), the word usually has the form *παιών*, though *παιάν* in Arist. *Rhet.* 1409". The accent of the contracted form is probably due to analogy: see Ruijgh (1968), 119, contrasting the transmitted perispomenon at D6. 181; also Radt (1958), 193 n. 1 and 199.

³ LSJ s.v. 1.2; p. 385 n. 12; Wernicke (1895), 62. Of Asclepius first, perhaps, in Soph. fr. 710 Radt (*Phineus*) (= Ar. *Pl.* 636); of Zeus in Rhodes according to Hesych. s.v. (iii. 253 Schmdt)—cf. p. 131; of Dionysus in Philod. *παιάν* and occasionally in tragedy (pp. 132-5); of Heracles in Ael. Arist. *Or.* 40. 21, 50. 42 (also p. 136).

⁴ See Cromey (1978), 65 ff. The inscription ΠΑΙΟΝΟΣ ΕΜΙ ('I am Paion's') on a Corinthian bronze helmet from the 6th cent. BC (Amandry (1971), 589 ff.; SEG 35 (1985), 253) is perhaps a case of the anthroponym also.

⁵ LSJ s.v. 1.3; examples include Aesch. *Ag.* 99; Soph. *Phil.* 168. It is used in the sense of a healing-dancer in *HH Ap.* 518 (p. 24). The form *παιήων* is not used in this sense in lyric poetry but only in the sense of a *παιάν*-song: see Rutherford (1990), 185. Cf. also *παιώνιος* in the sense 'healing' at Aesch. *Ag.* 512, 1199; *Pers.* 605; *Su.* 1066. For a Near Eastern parallel see Lipiński (1973).

⁶ Hom. *Il.* 5. 401, 899; *Od.* 4. 231, Hes., fr. 307; Solon, *IEG* 13. 57; later attestations include Nic. *Ther.* 439, 686; Nonn. *Dion.* 40. 407. See Fairbanks (1900), 4 ff. The identity of Apollo and Paian in the *Iliad* seems to have been argued for

Παιήων,⁷ perhaps also of the classical Greek deity Pan.⁸ By the time of the composition of the Pythian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, (Ie-)Paieon seems to have become an alternative name for Apollo.⁹

Of the two senses of the word παιάν (song and deity), one ought to be prior, but which? One might look to other cases of homonymy between the name of a deity and the name of an associated type of song: διθύραμβος (Διθύραμβος was an epithet of Dionysus), ὑμέναιος (a wedding song; Hymenaeus was a hero); ἰάλεμος, λίνος, and βῶρμος (three types of dirge: Ialemos, Linos, and Bormos were heroes linked aetiologically to the three types of song); ἰουλος and λιτυέρσης (types of reaping song; Ioulos and Lityerses were heroes).¹⁰ However, in all these cases the relative priority of the two senses is uncertain. In

by Crates of Mallos (fr. 55a, b. in Mette (1952), 71–3) and Zenodotus (ΣVirg. *Aen.* 10. 738, Thilo and Hagen, iii/2. 448. 5 = fr. 2 in Pusch (1890), xi).

⁷ There are two, perhaps three, occurrences. (1) *pa-ja-wo-ne* in KN V 52 (the last syllable confirmed in Killen and Olivier (1971)); (2) *pa-ja-o-ne* in KN C 394. 3. On these see Gérard-Rousseau (1968), 164–5; Ventris and Chadwick (1973), 311 n. 208. (3) There is also *pa-ja-ni-jo* in KN Fp 354: Ventris and Chadwick (1973), 126, deny that this belongs with (1) and (2). Furumark (1954), 34, suggested that it might represent the dative form of the name of a month (i.e. Παιανίω); Gérard-Rousseau suggested the name of the genre; Morpurgo-Davies and Duhoux (1988), 197, take it as the name of some deity.

⁸ The possibility that Pan continues the Mycenaean *paiawon* was suggested by Ruijgh (1967), 107, pointing to the identity between the Lesbian form *páων* and a form of the name 'Pan' known from Melpaea in Arcadia (*IG* v/2. 556). There is plenty of evidence linking Pan with the παιάν, suggesting assimilation with 'Paian'. (1) *Aen.* Tact. 27 says that the best cure for an attack of military 'panic' (τὸ πάνειον) is for the army to sing the παιάν, which could represent a traditional association between the battle-παιάν and τὸ πάνειον (Borgeaud (1988), 88 ff.). (2) *PMG* 936 (*Epiclaudian Hymn to Pan*), 19, ends with an invocation to Pan which resembles the παιάν refrain with Πάν Πάν substituted for παιάν (cf. *Soph. Aj.* 694, cited p. 70). (3) There was a tradition that Pan danced one of Pindar's *Paianes*, cited §6 n. 19. (4) An inscription from Panopolis in Upper Egypt (§6 n. 7) refers to a *παιανιστής* called Sarapion: was he employed in a local cult of Pan? (5) At *Men. Dusk.* 230–1 the transmitted text mentions *παιανισταί* who sing in honour of Pan, but for the sake of metre this is emended to *πανισταί* (otherwise *πανιασταί*: *IG* xii/1. 155. 76, *IG Rom* iv. 1680). But perhaps the *πανισταί* of the *Duskolos* will themselves be comic counterparts of real-life *παιανισταί*. The evidence for a link between Pan and the παιάν, then, is quite strong. However, other etymologies for 'Pan' are possible; cf. Brown (1977).

⁹ Usener (1896), 153 ff., argued that Paian was an independent deity even into the 5th cent. BC, citing such passages as *Aesch. Ag.* 146 and *Pind. Pyth.* 4. 270–1, where I would have thought the reference is clearly to Apollo. Fairbanks (1900) made the mistake of following Usener in this hypothesis.

¹⁰ The epithet *Διθύραμβος*: *Eur. Ba.* 526; *Philod. παιάν* 1. Hymenaeus: *Thr.* III (fr. 128c), 7. Ialemos: *Thr.* III (fr. 128c), 9; *Apollodorus of Athens, FGrH* 244 F 149 (*Περὶ θεῶν*). Linus: *Her.* 2. 79; *Ar. Byz.* fr. 340 Slater. Bormos: *Nymphis* of

some cases the name of a deity was perhaps transferred to a song in which the deity was invoked (for example, *λιτυέρσης* looks more like the name of a deity than the name of a genre). In other cases the name of the song could well be prior, and the use of the word as the name of a deity could be an aetiological back-formation; thus, *ιάλεμος* looks as if it may be based on a cry of mourning, so we would expect the associated hero to be a secondary development.¹¹

In the case of the *παιάν*, movement from name of song to name of deity seems the less likely alternative.¹² Support for it might be sought in the likelihood that the adjective *ἰήϊος*, which is a rare epithet for Paian or Apollo, started off as the first part of the *παιάν*-cry *ἰή*.¹³ However, the existence of the *παιάν*-cry points the other way, since this presupposes belief in a deity who can be addressed as 'Paian'. This hypothesis seems to be supported by line 517 of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, where the song is designated by the word *ἰηπαιών*, which can only be a reapplication of an appeal to 'Paian'.¹⁴ A parallel from the modern age would be the musical genre 'Requiem', which has its origins in a Christian chant that begins with this word.¹⁵ In some early texts the meaning of the word *παιάν* is ambiguous, accommodating either interpretation, and these may well reflect the semantic development from one to the other. An example is Hom. *Il.* 1. 472-4:

οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἰλάσκοντο
καλὸν αἰδόντες παιήονα κούροι Ἀχαιῶν
μέλποντες Ἑκάεργον.

(And they propitiated the god in song all day, singing the fair paean, the young men of the Achaeans, singing the Far-shooter.)

καλὸν αἰδόντες παιήονα is formally very close to *μέλποντες Ἑκάεργον*,

Heracleia, *FGH* 432 F 5 (*Περὶ Ἡρακλείας*); Ioulos: Apollodorus, loc. cit. Lityerses: Apollodorus, loc. cit.; P. Maas, *RE* s.v. *Lityerses*, xxv. 806-7.

¹¹ See Fairbanks (1900), 8 ff. (perhaps the most valuable part of Fairbanks's book).

¹² This line of development is argued for by Entralgo (1970), 56-7.

¹³ See §4 n. 8.

¹⁴ *ἰηπαιών* is also used as the name of the deity in line 272; so in *PMG* 922, apparently a fragment of a lyric narrative, editors restore forms of a noun *ἰηπαιάν*, twice in the sense of the song (lines 10-11), once perhaps of the god (line 15). Exactly parallel is the Dionysiac genre *ἰόβακχος*, attested at Procl. *Chrest.* 320^b31 ff.: Färber (1936), ii. 41.

¹⁵ Like the word 'requiem', *παῖνα* might in some cases have come at the start of the song, as in the Erythraean *παῖν* to Asclepius. For this interpretation (apropos of the 'Te Deum') see Boisacq (1916), ii. 738.

but has a different syntax if (as seems to be the case) *παίηονα* is an internal accusative with *αἰδόντες*, whereas *Ἐκάεργον* is a direct object of *μέλποντες*. Sappho 44. 33V is similar. The equivalence between the two syntaxes is fascinating: might it indicate, as Walter Burkert suggests, that the healing-deity and the healing-song were perceived as almost identical?¹⁶

Let us assume, then, that the *παίαν* started as a song-dance performance in honour of the deity Paian/Paiawon. What types of performance is Paiawon likely to have been associated with early on? One might look to the etymology of the name, but unfortunately this remains obscure. Ancient scholars suggested links both with the verb *παύω*, because apotropaic prayers are addressed to the deity, or with *παίω*, because the deity or his worshippers engage in some sort of striking (in either case a hypothetical noun derived from either root—i.e. **παιᾶ*—might have been expanded with the suffix *-ων*).¹⁷ Modern scholars have suggested that the word might be connected with the Sanskrit root *pu* ('purify'), or perhaps with the name of the Paeonians, or that it might derive from the Egyptian *p3iwn* ('the barbarian').¹⁸ None of these is compelling, and it may be that the true etymology has not been discovered.

A context that looks early is battle. The *παίαν* sung before battle was sometimes linked with a ritual cry in honour of Eneaias, and it may be more than a coincidence that Paian/Paiawon and Eneaias are linked in a Linear B tablet from Knossos (KN v 52):

a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja | *u[]* [
e-nu-wa-ri-jo | *pa-ja-wo-ne* | *po-se-da[-o-ne*

This tablet need not have been dedicated with a military purpose.

¹⁶ Burkert (1985), 267.

¹⁷ *παύω*: Macr. Sat. 1. 17. 17 (derived in part from Apollodorus of Athens, *Περὶ θεῶν*, bk. 14 = FGrH 244 F 90), revived by Schwyzler (1912), 443 ff., postulating **παιᾶ*; E. Diehl (1940), 90, suggested a link with the idea of beating the ground; the similarity between *παύω* and *παίαν* is the source of a joke at Ar. *Peace*, 453–4 (pp. 117–18). *παίω*: Didymus, cited in *EGud* (Sturz), 446. 51 (= 4. 9. 5, 390 Schmidt); Macr. Sat. 1. 17. 16; *EM* 657. 11; *EGud* (Sturz), 446. 50; revived by Pisani (1929), 208, postulating **παιᾶ* as a noun from *παύω*. Again, there are resonances in the 5th cent. BC, e.g. Eur. *Alc.* 31, 64, 220–6 (§11 n. 11); Soph. *OT* 150 (*πανστήριος* as an epithet of Apollo); Isyllus, *παίαν*, 56–7.

¹⁸ Pictet (1856), 40, derives the word from the PIE *pū* 'purify'. Paeonians: Her. 5. 1 (?); Macurdy (1912), (1930); *contra* Cromey (1978), 63 ff. Egyptian etymology: Bernal (1987), 454 n. 50; (1991), 171. Two suggestions from the 19th cent. are worth mentioning: Welcker (1857), 542, argued that *παίων* was equivalent to **Φαίων* ('shiner'), with loss of aspiration; and Baunack (1886), 153–4, suggested that *ἰὴ παίαν* might be a misunderstanding of ἰὴ ἐπ' **αἰᾶνα* ('go to the helper').

Nevertheless, the conjunction of these deities may indicate that Paiawon was a military deity at Knossos, and that the use of the *παῖάν* in battle was very ancient.¹⁹ Perhaps the name was felt to be related to the verb *παίω* ('the one with the striking'), which is different from saying that this is the etymology. Another indication that Paiawon had a military role early on is that one of the two *παῖᾶνες* mentioned in Homer's *Iliad* is performed in the context of battle (in fact after a victory)—*Il.* 22. 391–4.²⁰

Another early function could be purification and healing. The earliest evidence is Hom. *Il.* 1. 472–4, in which the Greeks sing a purificatory *παῖάν* to stop a plague. A Spartan tradition associates the healing *παῖάν* with Crete, and reports that it was exported from there to Sparta by Thaletas of Gortyn, who was called in to heal a plague (see p. 37). An independent reason for thinking this function might be early is that the divine name 'Paian' is understood to mean 'healer' in the classical period, and then again there is representation of 'Paieon' as a healing divinity in early Greek poetry. On the basis of this evidence Arthur Fairbanks, author of a classic treatment of the subject, argued that it was from the apotropaic *παῖάν* that all other paeanic functions stemmed; and Ludwig Deubner, the great scholar of Greek religion, also argued that the *παῖάν* started off in apotropaic Cretan *orgiasmus*.²¹

Neither Fairbanks nor Deubner had access to the Linear B evidence for the deity Paiawon. If Paiawon was a member of the Mycenaean Greek pantheon, the tradition that the *παῖάν* was a comparatively recent importation from Crete would be weakened; on the other hand, the extant references to Paiawon are all in tablets from Knossos, so perhaps there is something in the Cretan tradition after all. The idea that the apotropaic or purificatory function was the original one is another matter. While an account of the *παῖάν*'s apotropaic function remains a necessary task for any reconstruction

¹⁹ *e-mu-wa-ri-jo*: Gérard-Rousseau (1968), 89 ff. Battle *παῖᾶνες*: §5c–d. Late sources which imply that the pre-battle *παῖάν* was sung to Eueolios: §5 n. 30.

²⁰ Watkins (1995), 510, has suggested that this text reflects an early phase of Greek song in which such a *παῖάν* would have been composed in the paroemiac metre, which many scholars believe is very ancient, analysing: ἡράμεθα μέγα κύδος | ἐπέφνομεν Ἑκτορα δῖον, | ᾧ Τρώες κατὰ ἄστυ | θεῶ ὡς εὐχέσονται. He connects this song with the theme of dragon-slaying in other IE poetries, of which the association of the *παῖάν* with the Pythoconia could be another reflection.

²¹ Fairbanks (1900), 68; Deubner (1919), 399 = (1982), 218; Cretan origin is also taken seriously by Huxley (1975). Contrast the view of Schwalbe (1847), that the *παῖάν* was at an earlier stage a song of thanksgiving or jubilation.

of its origins, I remain unconvinced that the earliest *παιᾶνες* were simply healing-songs. When Paiawon/Paian was called on to heal, the indications are that it was primarily in the context of battle and military training. I would suggest that the healing powers of the deity and the song were originally confined to military, or quasi-military, contexts, and that they were generalized only later, if at all.

A second stage in the development of the cult of Paiawon and of the *παιάν* was when Paiawon underwent syncretism with Apollo.²² The obvious interpretation of the data is that this syncretism took place in the early centuries of the first millennium BC, late enough for a trace of the distinction to survive in early poetry. This could be tied in with the hypothesis that the figure of Apollo is strongly influenced by Near Eastern models that the Greeks might have encountered in this period, and the idea that Apollo is a newcomer finds support in the absence of his name from extant Linear B texts.²³ However, Apollo may have been around in Greece much longer; support continues to grow for the hypothesis that the name 'Apollo' has a Greek etymology after all, being connected with the word *ἀπέλλα* ('assembly').²⁴ For all we know, syncretism between Apollo and Paiawon had already taken place when the Knossos tablets were written; perhaps the name 'Apollon' was already in existence but was avoided for some reason in the tablets. The evidence of Homer and other poetic sources for two distinct deities could then be interpreted as an even more ancient archaism.

Paiawon and Apollo were probably related long before they merged. If Paiawon was a protector of the warriors and a healer of battle-wounds, Apollo was associated with the men in peacetime assembly (I rely here on the connection with the word *ἀπέλλα*). They may have existed in a relationship of quasi-syncretism for a long period. Gradually Apollo took over the role of Paiawon along with his name and the song-dance performances associated with it. However, Paiawon survived in poetry as a battlefield healer. The

²² A valuable study of syncretism in early Greek religion is Lévêque (1975).

²³ The best candidate is the Canaanite deity Reshef, whose name may reflect that of the Egyptian god Harsaphes: Burkert (1975a), 51 ff. There may also be a link to the Anatolian deity Telepinus, whose name could be the model for the Apolline epithet 'Delphinios': Burkert (1979), 123 ff.

²⁴ Burkert (1975b), associating Apollo with the early Greek assembly known as the *ἀπέλλα*, and Graf (1979), linking him with the Ionian Delphinion. In support of Burkert see Heubeck (1987).

process of syncretism no doubt changed the genre. It may be that from being primarily associated with the battlefield it subsequently became more integrated into the peacetime functioning of the polis.

Asclepius also inherits the name, and perhaps takes over his 'healing' role. This development is probably late, if Asclepius was imported from the Near East in the early part of the first millennium BC.²⁵ Perhaps at an intermediate stage Paiawon is not only reinterpreted as a name of Apollo, but also given an independent role as his son, who is a sort of double of his father (there are other cases where an epithet of Apollo and the name of a son of his are homonyms).²⁶ Asclepius is subsequently identified with the son, lending him his name. The name Paiawon is then left as an alternative title for both father and son, underlining the link between the two.

The two unusual features of the deity Paiawon—his association with song and his tendency to become assimilated to other deities—may in fact have been linked. Thus, a primary manifestation of syncretism between Apollo and Paiawon is likely to have been that *παιάν*-performances were made in his honour, because addressing Apollo as Paiawon would have been an important part of these. The use of *παιάν*-performance is likely to follow the initial realization of syncretism between the deities, but it is also likely to encourage and corroborate it once it has become established.

Thus, Paiawon's legacy to the fifth century BC contained loose ends. The primary application of the name Paian was to Apollo, but this link was not exclusive. For one thing, vestiges of the obsolete deity survived, for example in traditions of performance on the battlefield. And, secondly, in so far as it was interpreted as 'healer', the name was also associated with Asclepius, and with other deities perceived as capable of healing. Uncertainty over the scope of the name 'Paian' contributes to the ambiguities that characterize the application of the *παιάν* in classical sources: is it Apollo's genre? Is the dimly remembered Paiawon still sometimes the real addressee? Or can a *παιάν* be addressed to any deity who can be invoked as 'healer'? We shall see how these problems develop later on (see in particular §§5a–b, 5e).

²⁵ Asclepius probably continues the Assyrian god Azugallatu: Burkert (1992), 75 ff.

²⁶ The case of Kastalios and Eikadios is similar: see p. 206.

3. A TYPOLOGY OF PAEANIC TEXT AND PERFORMANCE

It will be useful for the reader to have an idea of the types of performances and texts that this survey will be dealing with. The most common sense of *παιάν*, both in ancient Greece and in this book, is a type of song-dance performance in which a text, often marked by appeals to an addressee under the name 'Paian' (usually, but not always, Apollo), is sung by a group of performers to the accompaniment of instrumental music, while the performers simultaneously dance.

Such *παιάν*-songs fall into various types. Some are simpler with short verses and regular refrains, whereas some are much more complex, the latter type including most of the surviving *Paianes* of Pindar. Performance usually involves both song and dance, but dance is probably absent in the case of those performed by *κιθαρῳδοί* at Delphi, or *παιᾶνες* performed at *συμπόσια*. Even *παιᾶνες* composed for song-dance performance would lack dance when reperformed at the *συμπόσιον*.¹

Even song was probably absent in the case of *παιᾶνες* composed in metres that we would expect to have been recited without music, e.g. the elegiac couplet; we can call these '*παιάν*-poems'. (All the extant examples are Hellenistic or Roman; later on I suggest that we see these as variations on the usual pattern.) Furthermore, even *παιᾶνες* which would normally have been performed with song and dance might in exceptional circumstances be 'performed' without either, i.e. simply recited or displayed; later on I discuss the possibility that some of the Pindaric *Paianes* might have been published and not performed.²

Many other lyric genres could be categorized in some such way. But what is unusual about the *παιάν* is that it is closely related to a form of utterance found in everyday speech. This is the *παιάν*-cry, a common exclamation of the form *ἰή* (sometimes *ἰὼ*, and perhaps *ἰή*) *παιάν* (sometimes *παιών*), which is construed as an appeal to a 'Paian'.³ It was used to express extreme emotion, almost always

¹ Simple and complex types: §7*d*. *παιᾶνες* performed at *συμπόσια*: §3*f*.

² Metrical variations: pp. 127–8. Recited or displayed: §20.

³ The form with the rough breathing: Call. *Hymn* 2, 103 (cf. 80); fr. 18. 6; restored in fr. 260. 10; A.R. 2. 702 (as a variant in the Laurentian MS); although it supports the aetiology of the *παιάν*-cry from *ἰεῖ*, *παῖ*, *ἰόν* (see p. 25), it would be unlike Callimachus to use the rough breathing unless it was independently attested.

that of joy, rarely that of distress; and in certain sacred contexts, especially sacrifice, its force is one of ritually correct utterance or *εὐφημία*.⁴ The problem of its grammatical classification engaged scholars; one theory we find is that it was an apotropaic proverb (*ἀλεξήτηριος* . . . *παροιμία*), recalling Apollo's fight with the Delphic dragon.⁵

The *παιάν*-cry is often found in sources that seem to reflect the speech of everyday life, such as Aristophanes.⁶ It was often uttered by a group,⁷ and, since a single utterance of *ἰὴ παιάν* would have had limited impact, it seems to have been common to repeat it.⁸ Its utterance is frequently denoted by the verb (-) *παιανίζω*.⁹ Such repeated utterances may sometimes have resembled song. Utterance of the *παιάν*-cry was mostly confined to men, a predictable correlation in view of the close association between Apollo and men's groups;¹⁰ in the same way a correlation can be observed between the gender of speakers and the gender of the deities by whom they swear.¹¹

The *παιάν*-cry is related to three other common exclamations. The first is the *ὀλολυγή*, apparently realized by repeating or sustaining the syllable *ὀλ*-, and frequently denoted by the verb (-) *ὀλολύζω*.¹² Its functions are similar to those of the *παιάν*-cry: the expression of extreme emotion, most often joy, sometimes also anxiety; and

⁴ Joy: Ar. *Peace*, 453, 555; *Birds*, 1763; *Lys.* 1291; Eur. *Erechth.* fr. 65. 6 Austin. Distress: the only example I know is Ar. *Ach.* 1212, cited p. 118. *εὐφημία*: Ar. *Peace*, 453 (cf. 433–4); *Thesm.* 311 (cf. 295–6).

⁵ Clearchus of Soli *Περὶ παροιμιῶν A'*, fr. 64 Wehrli = Athen. 701 D. Pythoctonia aetiology: p. 25.

⁶ Ar. *Ach.* 1212; *Peace*, 453.

⁷ e.g. Ar. *Kn.* 1318: the whole theatre is to utter the *παιάν*-cry.

⁸ At Ar. *Thesm.* 1311 the *παιάν*-cry is repeated three times. According to Heraclides of Pontus (fr. 158 Wehrli = Athen. 701 E–F; cf. Terentianus Maurus, *De litteris syllabis metris*, 1591–4 = Keil (1857), 373), the trimeter was invented when Apollo repeated *ἰὴ παιάν* thrice, and this could be the aetiology of the practice of repeating the *παιάν*-cry three times in cult. Similar triple structures are discussed also by Norden (1939), 242 ff.

⁹ Alternatively *παιωνίζω*. Compounds are *ἐπιπαιανίζω* (Diod. 5. 29. 4), *συμπαιανίζω* (Dem. 19. 128; Polyb. 2. 29. 6); *ἀντιπαιανίζω* at Aen. Tact. 27. 4. Note also *ἱππαιωνίζω* formed from the *παιάν*-cry at Ar. *Kn.* 408.

¹⁰ See §6a.

¹¹ See E. Ziebarth, *RE*, s.v. *Eid*, x. 2076 ff.; Bain (1984), 39 ff.

¹² See in general Deubner (1941). The basic verb is found compounded with *ἐπ*-, *συν*-, *ἀν*-, *κατ*-. The form with *ἀν*- perhaps expresses the beginning of a sustained cry, as in *ἀναλαλάζω* (below); the absence of *ἀναπαιανίζω* (though cf. Hesychius 1. 132 and 179 Latte) is perhaps to be explained by the fact that the *παιάν*-cry was not sustained in the same way; see Brunel (1939), 48.

also ritually correct utterance in certain sacred contexts.¹³ Generally the *ὀλολυγή* is confined to women, a gender-marking which is particularly noticeable when it accompanies male utterance of the *παιάν*-cry.¹⁴ The second related cry is *ἐλελεῦ*, repeated *ἐλ-*, denoted by the verb *ἐλελίζω*; this is occasionally confused with the preceding, but is more often a distinct cry, uttered by men, often as a war-cry.¹⁵ The third related cry is the *ἀλαλή*, articulated *ἀλαλαί* and often denoted by the verb *(-)ἀλαλάζω*.¹⁶ Its special function was as a war-cry, but it also seems to have been used as a general expression of extreme fear or joy, and was also a ritual cry.¹⁷ Perhaps because of its association with war, it tends to be confined to men, so that it can be an alternative to, and is sometimes combined with, *ἡ παιάν*.¹⁸

Between the *παιάν*-song and the *παιάν*-cry there is a close relationship with both a functional and a formal dimension. The functional similarity is that, like the *παιάν*-cry, the *παιάν*-song can be thought of as a form of appeal to *Paiawon/Paian* or at least some deity who deserved that name, and like it used to express victory and jubilation, and also as a form of ritually correct utterance on sacred occasions. (A minor difference is that while the *παιάν*-song is routinely used as an apotropaic prayer in negative contexts, use of the *παιάν*-cry

¹³ Joy: Eur. *El.* 691; Ar. *Kn.* 1327; *Peace*, 97; Theocr. 17. 64. Anxiety: Aesch. *Cho.* 386. *εὐφήμια*: Ar. *Peace*, 96–7; Aesch. *Ag.* 28, 594–6; Xen. *Eph.* 5. 13; Call. *Hymn* 5. 139; Hom. *Od.* 3. 450.

¹⁴ See Deubner (1941), 1–2, citing Heliod. 3. 5. 2; Ach. Tat. 3. 2. 8. For the female associations of the *ὀλολυγή* see also Her. 4. 189; Hom. *Od.* 3. 450; Aesch. *Ag.* 594–6, 1118. There is an exceptional male utterance of the *ὀλολυγή* at Aesch. *Cho.* 386, perhaps suggesting the effeminacy of Aegisthus. We find an exceptional female utterance of the *παιάν*-cry at Aesch. *Sept.* 267–9, where *ὀλολυγή* and *παιάν*-cry are combined; and also in the aetiology, according to which its *etymon* (ἔει, παῖ, ἴον) was first uttered by Leto or some nymphs (see p. 25).

¹⁵ Replacing *ὀλολυγή*: Sappho, 44. 31–3. As a war-cry: Xen. *Ana.* 5. 2. 14; 1. 8. 18. Hesych. ii. 64 Latte calls *ἐλελεῦ* the *προαναφώνησις τοῦ παιανισμοῦ* ('prelude to the singing of the *παιάν*'); not found in compounds.

¹⁶ The verb is found compounded with *ἐπ-*, *συν-*, *ἀν-*, *κατ-*.

¹⁷ *ἀλαλαί*: p. 43; Xen. *Ana.* 4. 3. 19; *Hell.* 2. 4. 17; *Ana.* 6. 5. 27; *Cyr.* 7. 1. 9. The epithet *ἀλαλάξιος* is used of Ares (Cornutus, *ND* 21; though of Zeus at Call. *Aet.* fr. 75. 60); Pindar composed a song beginning with an invocation to *Ἀλαλά*, the 'daughter of War' (fr. 78). In view of the function, one might expect that this song would be a *παιάν*, but it was classed as a *Dithurambos* (ΣAesch. *Pers.* 49 = Dähnhardt (1894), 27). The Babylonian *alala* was remarkably similar: see *The Assyrian Dictionary* (Chicago, 1964), i. 329.

¹⁸ *ἀλαλαί* is found in a negative context at Eur. *Pho.* 335; in a positive context at Eur. *Supp.* 719; *HF* 981. For its use in ritual see Xen. *Ana.* 4. 3. 19; Pind. fr. 70b. 13.

with such a force is rare.) And as with the *παιάν*-cry, there is some tendency for the *παιάν*-song to be associated with men or boys; one could think of this as a reflex of the association of the *παιάν* with Apollo, who is specially associated with male social groups.¹⁹

To turn to the formal side of the relationship, many *παιάν*-songs contain a repeated refrain similar in form to the *παιάν*-cry. This parallel is sharpened by the fact that, just as the *παιάν*-refrain tends to come at the end of a formal unit such as a strophe or triad, so the *παιάν*-cry generally follows a significant event or speech as a marker performing the speech-acts of closure and endorsement (there is a parallel with the use 'Amen' in Christian ritual). Hence, we can think of a refrain-bearing *παιάν*-song either as an expansion of the simple *παιάν*-cry or as a structure incorporating the *παιάν*-cry within it.²⁰

The refrain was not a consistent feature of the genre; many songs that would have probably been classed as *παιάνες* in the fifth century BC lacked them, such as Ariphron's *παιάν* to Health and at least one of Pindar's Delphian *Paianes* (D6). However, the performance of a refrainless song may have been followed by a group utterance of the *παιάν*-cry, which need not have appeared in the written version of the text. Such communal utterances of the *παιάν*-cry will have served the purpose of allowing people other than the primary performers to express their participation in, and endorsement of, the performance, and in this way to become, as it were, secondary performers themselves.²¹

The close relationship between *παιάν*-cry and *παιάν*-song is illustrated by the fact that they command the same vocabulary. *παιανίζω* usually means 'utter the *παιάν*-cry', but sometimes the sense can be 'sing a *παιάν*-song', e.g. in the inscription introducing the Erythraean *παιάν* to Apollo (CA 140): *παιωνίζειν πρῶτον περὶ τὸν βωμὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τόνδε τὸν παιῶνα ἑστρίς* ('First sing this paean around the altar of Apollo three times'). Here the reference is to the *παιάν*-song that follows. Conversely, while *παιάν*/*παιών* is usually interpreted in the sense of '*παιάν*-song', it probably sometimes means

¹⁹ Combination of *ἀλαλαί* and *ἰὴ παιάν* occurs at Ar. *Birds*, 1763; *Lys.* 1291; Eur. *Erechth.* fr. 65. 5 Austin; Xen. *Ana.* 4. 3. 19; for *ἀλαλαί* as an alternative to the *παιάν*-cry see Heliod. 3. 5.

²⁰ On 'Amen' as a marker in speech-act theory see Werlen (1984), 227 ff.

²¹ Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 350. 3-4; *Per.* 392-3; *Sept.* 635, 869-70; Eur. *IT* 1403-4. The phrase *παιάν πεποιημένος* ('a composed *παιάν*'), used by Plut. *Flam.* 16. 6. 2 (= CA 173), is perhaps meant to distinguish a *παιάν*-song from a simple *παιάν*-cry.

no more than 'παιάν-cry'.²² Sometimes the meaning of these words is uncertain. Take, for example, this passage from the inscription regulating the duties of the Milesian *Μολποί* (lines 28 ff.):²³

καὶ παιωνίζεται πρῶτον παρ' Ἑκάτῃ τῇ πρόσθεν πυλῶν, παρὰ Δυνάμει, εἶτεν ἐπὶ Λειμῶνι ἐπ' ἄκρο παρὰ Νύμφαις, εἶτεν παρ' Ἑρμῇ ἐν Κελάδο, παρὰ Φυλίῳ, κατὰ Κεραϊτὴν παρὰ Χαρέω ἀνδριάσιν.

(The paean is sung first by the Hecate in front of the gates, by Dynamis, then in the Meadow at the top by the Nymphs, then by Hermes in Kelados, by Phyllos, along Keraiites, by the statues of Chares.)

The passive *παιωνίζεται* is of a type common in ritual statements.²⁴ One's first intuition is that it refers to a communal utterance of ἡ παιάν. But the end of the inscription indicates that there was a singer present (τῷ ᾠδῶ in line 45), so I would suggest at least that the singer sang verses and the *χορός* chanted antiphonally. It may even be that the *Μολποί* joined in with the singing (this would certainly suit their name). Here, as fairly often, the exact nature of the performance escapes us.

Hence, I would suggest that *παιάν-cry* and *παιάν-song* should be seen as realizations of the same basic structure, one the minimal realization, the other a developed and extended form. As a final observation, it is worth noting that the developed or extended form of the structure that we have distinguished may not have been confined to poetry and song, but may sometimes have manifested itself in non-poetic spoken utterances also (for example, if a prose prayer is rounded off by a *παιάν-cry*, as apparently at Ar. *Thesm.* 295 ff.). Such a non-poetic paeanic utterance, distinguished from the *παιάν-song* and the *παιάν-poem* by the absence of metre or music, deserves its own category in our typology, and I suggest we call it 'paeanic speech'. Attestations of this are rare, but perhaps it is under-represented in our sources.

Thus, different forms of paeanic utterance, along with their principal *differentiae*, can be represented in the accompanying table, in

²² For the refrain see further §7b.

²³ *LSAM* no. 50; the *Μολποί* are discussed further p. 60.

²⁴ The impersonal passive can be compared to the same word in *IG* xii/8. 358(a); *παιωνίζεται* at Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 161 (*Niobe*) could be either impersonal or personal passive; a second impersonal formation *παιάν ἐγένετο* ('the *παιάν* happened') in line 12 of the *Μολποί* inscription can be paralleled in Xen. *Cyr.* 3. 3. 59; the same construction is found in *θύεται* at D6. 62. See Wackernagel (1925); Schwyzler (1950), ii. 239. 4. The Mycenaean *ijeto* (PY Tn 316) may be a similar formation from a verb related to *ιέρως*, on which see Palmer (1963), 264–7; Gérard-Rousseau (1968), 114.

TABLE 1. *Different Forms of Paeanic Utterance*

	παιάν- cry	'paeanic speech'	'παιάν- poem'	συμπόσιον- παιάν/citha- rodiac παιάν	παιάν-song	
					inartistic	artistic
appeal to παιάν	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
supporting text	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	
artistic form	no	no	yes	yes	yes	
elaborate structure	no	no	?	?	no	yes
song	no	no	no	yes	yes	
dance	no	no	no	no	usually	

order of complexity with the παιάν-cry on the left and the παιάν-song on the right, and with some other forms in between. These types can be thought of as mapping out a field of different types of paeanic utterance and performance. I would suggest that in some circumstances these different types would have been alternative utterances available to speakers. Choice between them may have been partly influenced by the nature of the performance scenario: was it ordinary and regular, or, though extraordinary, nevertheless unexpected and unprepared for, in which case we might expect a παιάν-cry or perhaps a spoken παιάν-prayer, or was it formal and ritually marked, requiring the performance of rehearsed ceremony (such as a major festival), in which case we might expect a παιάν-song?

4. THE APOLLINE ΠΑΙΆΝ

The primary association of the cult παιάν was with Apollo (to whom the name Παιάν usually applies). Apollo and Artemis can be addressed jointly, though it is rare for a παιάν to be dedicated to Artemis alone.¹ The special association with Apollo and Artemis is implied in the proem of a Pindaric *Threnos* which begins with a priamel contrasting various types of song (*Thr.* III = fr. 128c):

ἔντι μὲν χρυσαλακάτου τεκέων Λατοῦς ἀοιδαὶ
 ὦ[ρ]λαι παιάνιδες· ἔντι [δὲ] καὶ
 θάλλοντος ἐκ κισσοῦ στεφάνων Διο[νύ]σου . . .²

(On the one hand there are paeanic songs in season belonging to the chil-

¹ For παιᾶνες to Artemis see e.g. Eur. *IA* 1467–80. Artemis had her own genre in the οὔπηγος: ΣΑ.Ρ. 1. 972 (85. 9 Wendel); Athen. 619 B; Pollux, 1. 38; Färber (1936), i. 44.

² For a different view of ὦραι see Cannatà Fera (1990), 136 ff.; (1980).

dren of Leto of the golden distaff; on the other hand there are also [songs] . . . from crowns of blooming ivy belonging to Dionysus (?) . . .)

Almost all Apolline παιᾶνες refer to some specific religious centre. In this section I shall survey the main ones, and discuss the use of the παιάν in pilgrimage to sanctuaries of Apollo.

(a) *The παιάν at Delphi*

The Apolline παιάν is specially linked with Delphi, and it was there according to Greek tradition that it was first established. Thus, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* describes how Apollo led the Cretan priests in the first παιάν (516–19):³

οἱ δὲ ῥήσσοντες ἔποντο
Κρήτες πρὸς Πυθῶ καὶ ἱηπαίων' αἶδον
οἳ τ' ἐ Κρητῶν παιήνες, οἳ τ' ἐ Μοῦσα
ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔθηκε θεὰ μελίγηρυν ἀοιδήν

(And the Cretans followed to Delphi, stamping their feet as they went, and sang *iepaieon*, like the Cretan healers, and those in whose hearts the divine Muse has placed sweet-voiced song.)

This implies a Cretan origin not only for the cult of Apollo at Delphi but also for the παιάν. We find corroboration for both of these elsewhere: for the Cretan origin of the cult of Apollo in the tradition that the hero Eikadios started from Crete (perhaps mentioned by Pindar in A3);⁴ for the Cretan origin of the παιάν in the Spartan tradition that the songs of Thaletas of Gortyn cured a Spartan plague, and that his songs included παιᾶνες; perhaps also in the association of five-*mora* metre with Crete, attested as early as

³ Notice the sense of *παιήνες* in line 518: first in Pape (1880), ii. 438; von Blumenthal (1943), 2341, agrees, though suggesting that the true reading might be *παραγδόνες* (as at Hom. *Od.* 22. 348); followed also by Evelyn-White (1950), 361; defended by Huxley (1975). On aetiology in *HH Ap.* see also Kolk (1963); Panagl (1969–70). *HH Ap.* associates a different aetiology with the Pythoetonia—that of the toponym Πυθῶ from the rotting (*πύθομαι*) of the dragon's corpse (line 363).

⁴ See Guarducci (1943–6), 93. In a related tradition Apollo and Artemis fled to Crete after the killing of Python to be purified there by Carmanor: Paus. 2. 7. 7; 2. 30. 3; 10. 7. 2; 10. 16. 5; Aly (1908), 50 ff. As early as the 14th cent. BC Egyptians associated healing-prayers with the land of Keftiu (texts in Vercoutter (1956), 82; Strange (1980), 99), which is often taken to be Minoan Crete.

Cratinus.⁵ The fact that Linear B attestations of the divine name Paiawon are confined to Knossos is also thought-provoking.⁶

This contrasts with a tradition attested somewhat later but probably known to Pindar, that the παῖάν-cry and the associated Apolline epithet ἰήϊος had their origin in Apollo's fight with the Delphic dragon, when someone encouraged him by saying ἱεῖ or ἱεῖ ('shoot').⁷ Two versions of the folk etymology can be distinguished, according to how the second word of the παῖάν-cry was dealt with: in one version (1), attested for Ephorus, the second word is not etymologized at all, but interpreted in the sense 'healer'; in the other (2), which is the more common of the two, the second word is derived from παῖ (it is presupposed that Apollo was still a child when he shot the dragon), so that the complete ἔτυμον is ἱεῖ, παῖ ('shoot, child'), or less commonly ἱεῖ, παῖ, ἰόν ('shoot an arrow, child').⁸ Accounts varied as to who uttered the words: in one version it was Leto, which suits the παῖ element in (2), in others it was the citizens of Delphi or some local nymphs.⁹ The motif of the deity being encouraged in song as he carries out the dragon-slaying could be very old: thus, in the *Rgveda* goddesses weave a song while Indra kills the storm god Vṛtra.¹⁰ Nevertheless, a *terminus post quem* for this aetiology is suggested by its absence from the Pythian section of the *Homer*

⁵ Thaletas (or Thales): his songs cured plague: Pratinas, *PMG* 713 (iii), cited in ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1142 B-C; Philod. *De mus.* 18-19, 85-6 Kemke; his songs included παῖάδες: Porph. *Vita Pyth.* 32; Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 149 = Strabo 10. 4. 16 (was the ultimate source Polymnastus of Colophon? Paus. 1. 14. 4, θάλης); Cratinus at *PCG* iv. 242, fr. 237 (*Trophonius*) (see §7 n. 32).

⁶ Above, p. 12 n. 7.

⁷ ἱεῖ is a rare imperative form of ἱήμι, preferred for the purpose of the aetiology because it is closer to the derivative. It is found only in accounts of the aetiology (e.g. Athen. 701 D) and (in the compound ἄφιε) in late sources: *Hippiatrica Bero-linensis*, 15. 9. 4 Oder-Hoppe; Athan. *De virginitate*, 23. 5 Goltz; Basilius, *Homilia de virginitate*, 2. 21 (in *Revue Bénédictine*, 63 (1953), 39).

⁸ See Schreiber (1879); Strunk (1960), 79 ff.; Williams (1978), 85 (on line 103); Hunter (1986), 54 ff. The source for version (1) is Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 F 31 = Strabo 9. 3. 2, discussed below), also Macr. *Sat.* 1. 17. 17; for version (2): Clearchus of Soli, *Περὶ παροιμιῶν* A', fr. 64 Wehrli = Athen. 701 D; Duris' *Σαμίων ὅροι* (*FGrH* 76 F 79 = *EM* s.v. ἱήϊε); A.R. 2. 701-13; Call. *Hymn* 2. 97-104 (only the last certainly includes the *ἰω* element). A corresponding etymology of ἡῖε at Hom. *Il.* 15. 365 is attributed to Aristarchus (Erbse (1969-83), iv. 88). Other etymologies: the school of Crates derived both ἰήϊος and ἡῖε from ἰάομαι: Macr. *Sat.* 1. 17. 16 (Erbse (1969-83), iv. 88; Helck (1905), 35 ff.); so παῖάν is sometimes derived from παύειν: p. 14; the element ἡῖ is connected with ἱέναι in Macr. *Sat.* 1. 17. 19; the epithet ἰήϊος is connected with εἶς 'one' by Plut. *De E ap. Delph.* 393 c.

⁹ Leto is the speaker in the accounts of Duris and Clearchus; the Delphians are the speakers in Ephorus and Callimachus; and local nymphs are the speakers in Apollonius of Rhodes.

¹⁰ *Rgveda*, 1. 61. 8a-b.

Hymn to Apollo. Set against this, the significance of the Pythoetonia aetiology would seem to be that it claims the origin of the *παῖάν*-cry for Delphi and overrides the hypothesis that it was imported from Crete. The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* may take us back to the early sixth century BC.¹¹ At about the same time Sacadas of Argos composed his *Πυθικός Νόμος*, a musical composition designed to imitate the conflict between Apollo and the Delphic dragon in several stages.¹² The third stage bore the name *κατακελευσμός*, a word which suggests the idea of bystanders encouraging Apollo to shoot the dragon.¹³ In that case the Pythoetonia aetiology may have already been around, although it cannot itself have been part of the *Πυθικός Νόμος*, since this lacked the verbal articulation that would have been required to spell out such an aetiology.

The *terminus ante quem* is provided by the prose sources of the fourth century BC. Etymology (1) is attested slightly earlier than version (2): version (1) is attested in a fragment of Ephorus' *Histories* preserved by Strabo, while the earliest attestation for etymology (2) is a fragment from Clearchus of Soli's *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*, transmitted by Athenaeus. Ephorus' reference to the Pythoetonia was part of his euhemerizing interpretation of Apolline mythology.¹⁴ The

¹¹ See most recently Janko (1982), 132, 200.

¹² *Πυθικός Νόμος*: Strabo 9. 3. 10, Pollux, 4. 84, hyp. Pind. *Pyth.* (Dr ii. 2. 10 ff.) all give a different list of parts. The text of Strabo assigns it to a Hellenistic general Timosthenes, but that must be mistaken. See in general H. Abert, *RE* iiA. 1768-9; Kolik (1963), 42-3.

¹³ Other explanations for the *κατακελευσμός* are offered by ancient sources: Strabo says it was the *ἀγών* and Pollux says that it was the section in which Apollo challenges the dragon (it is omitted in the hypothesis to Pindar's *Pythians*). But they may have been guessing. The verbs *ἐπικελεύω* and *ἐγκελεύω* are found in the accounts of the *παῖάν*-cry in Ephorus and Duris (see p. 25 n. 8). The word *κατακελεύω* is otherwise used of a boatswain commanding rowers (Ar. *Frogs*, 207, *Birds*, 1273; the *παῖάν*-cry and the *κέλευμα* of a boatswain are linked at Eur. *IT* 1403-4).

¹⁴ Apollo is represented as a culture hero who introduces agriculture in the area of Parnassus and eliminates local brigands, among them Python, alias Dragon: τοὺς δὲ Παρνασσίους . . . καὶ ἄλλον μνηῦσαι χαλεπὸν ἄνδρα, Πύθωνα τοῦνομα, ἐπὶ κλησὶν Δράκοντα, κατατοξεύοντος δ' ἐπικελεύειν ἱε παῖάν, ἃφ' οὗ τὸν παιανισμόν οὕτως ἐξ ἔθους παραδοθῆναι τοῖς μέλλουσι συμπίπτειν εἰς παράταξιν ἐμπρήσθαι δὲ καὶ σκηπὴν τότε τοῦ Πύθωνος ὑπὸ τῶν Δελφῶν, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν ἔτι καὶ αἰεὶ ὑπόμνημα ποιουμένους τῶν τότε γενομένων ('the Parnassians pointed out another troublesome fellow, who had the name "Python" and the nickname "Dragon". When he shot him dead, they shouted out "Shoot, healer", whence the tradition of the *παῖάν*-cry for those about to engage in battle. At the same time Python's tent was burnt by the Delphians, just as they do today in commemoration of those past events'). Ephorus' account shows a tendency towards Euhemerism (Henrichs (1984), 146): the reason why he singles out the detail of the burning of the tent is perhaps that it supports his hypothesis that Python was

Pythoetonia aetiology of the παιάν-cry is not directly attested from the fifth century BC. However, I would argue that the strength of the tradition in the fourth century BC suggests that it was not new, but had a certain history behind it. An additional factor is that the motif of Apollo killing the dragon while still a child is older than the fourth century BC: it is attested for the fifth century BC in a literary source (Eur. *IT* 1239 ff.), and for the fifth and even the late sixth century BC in iconographic sources (Apollo, accompanied sometimes by Artemis, is represented as shooting from the safety of Leto's arms).¹⁵ Version (2) of the etymology presupposes and is closely linked to this motif, and if the motif is older than the fourth century BC, the etymology may be also.

Παιᾶνες must have been performed at Delphi before the fifth century BC, though we know little about them. The earliest choral performances at Delphi were supposed to have been organized by the local poet Philammon (we are not told that they were παιᾶνες).¹⁶ Strabo says that κithαρῳδοί performed παιᾶνες at the Πύθια in the ancient contest, before the reorganization in 576 BC (after which purely instrumental performances were added).¹⁷ Alcæus' song in honour of Apollo, which, according to the summary of Himerius, described the birth of Apollo, his trip to the Hyperboreans, and his reception at Delphi upon his return south, could well have been intended for performance at Delphi. We know nothing about its

a man; similarly, with respect to the aetiology of the παιάν-cry, the fact that Ephorus, who is our earliest source for it, uses version (1) should not be taken to indicate that version (1) is the earliest, because if he had known version (2), he might well have rejected it because it did not suit his Euhemerizing version of the myth for Apollo to be addressed as a child.

¹⁵ The most important vases are: lecythos Paris, Cab. Méd. 306 (*ABV* 572, *Para* 294 = *LIMC* s.v. *Apollon*, 993 = Roscher (1884–1937), iii. 3407, fig. 4), from the second quarter of the 5th cent. BC; lecythos E. Berlin Staat. Mus. H2212 (Beazley, *ARV*² 330. 8 = *LIMC* s.v. *Apollon*, 988), from the second quarter of the 5th cent. BC: Apollo shoots from his mother's arms, though Python is not depicted; also a fragment of an Etruscan terracotta group from the late 6th cent. BC in the Villa Giulia (*LIMC* s.v. *Apollon/Aplu*, 10) and an Etruscan bronze mirror from the second quarter of the 5th cent. BC (Villa Giulia 51109, *LIMC* s.v. *Apollon/Aplu*, 11). See also Fontenrose (1959), 16–17, and appendix 7 (550).

¹⁶ Philammon: Heracleides of Pontus, fr. 157 Wehrli = ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1132 A; Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F 120; Paus. 10. 7. 2; cf. Procl. *Chrest.* 320^b1.

¹⁷ 9. 3. 10, 421. For the citharodes see p. 80. I wonder if the tradition of solo παιᾶνες does not serve the purpose of providing an intelligible transition from hypothetical παιᾶνες at Delphi to the νόμος at Delphi; Proclus saw the transitional form as the choral νόμος (pp. 102–3).

form. (From the fact that only one of three ancient sources for it refers to it as a *παῖάν*, while the others use the more general terms *ὕμνος* and *προοίμιον*, it might be inferred that this was a general lyric narrative praising Apollo, not explicitly marked as a *παῖάν*; but it is also possible that *ὕμνος* and *προοίμιον* in the other sources are being used in an entirely general sense.)¹⁸ The *παῖάν* of Tynnichus of Chalcis (seventh century BC?) may have been intended for performance at Delphi, since there was a tradition that Aeschylus declined an invitation from Delphi to compose a *παῖάν* for Apollo with the excuse that Tynnichus' *παῖάν* was much superior to anything he might compose.¹⁹ Dating from the later sixth or earlier fifth century BC is a fragment from a Simonidean Delphic *Paian* composed for an Andrian *χορός* (*PMG* 519, fr. 35(b), 12–13). Another lost Simonidean *Paian* dealt with the killing of the Delphic dragon, deriving Apollo's epithet *ἑκατος* from the hundred (*ἑκατόν*) arrows that he used to kill it (*PMG* 573).²⁰ From the fifth century BC we know of Delphic *παῖάνες* by Pindar: A2, probably connected with the Delphic Septerion, B2, describing the Myth of the Four Temples, and D6, telling the story of Neoptolemus. Lost songs of Pindar, which may well have been *παῖάνες*, dealt with Apollo's capture of the shrine (G2) and the story that Zeus chose the site of Delphi because it was the point where two eagles met (H1).

Παῖάνες were performed at all the major Delphic festivals: the Theoxenia, in the month of Theoxenios in the spring; the Puthia in the month of Boukatios in the summer, to the accompaniment of the *κιθάρα*; the Septerion, perhaps around the same time as the Puthia, when the *ἀμφιθαλής κούρος* returned to Delphi. They were probably also performed at the spring festival during the month of Busios, when Apollo was believed to return from the Hyperboreans.²¹

One of the few examples preserved complete is the Delphic *παῖάν* of Aristonoos of Corinth, composed in either 338 or 334 BC, and preserved on stone (R54).²² Its title calls it a *ὕμνος*, but this term is pre-

¹⁸ Alc. 307cV; for the generic issue see p. 92.

¹⁹ Porph. *De abst.* 2. 18 = *TrGF* iii. T114; Plato, *Ion*, 534 D, which preserves the isolated phrase (*PMG* 707) *εὕρημά τι Μοισάν* ('a discovery of the Muses').

²⁰ See Rutherford (1990), 192 ff.

²¹ For the Theoxenia see p. 310; for the Septerion see pp. 201–2; for the spring festival see Alc. 307cV; Bacch. 16, opening. Mommsen (1878), 280 ff. suggested that this festival might have been the Theophania mentioned by Her. 1. 51; see von Pomtow (1901), 2532.

²² The date is determined on the basis of the archonship of Damochares, men-

sumably used in a general sense.²³ The metre is aeolo-choriambic, arranged in six stanzas with meshymnion ἢ ἔ Παῖάν and refrain ᾦ ἔ Παῖάν. The six stanzas fall into three sections: the first (stanzas 1–2) describes Apollo and his oracle; the second (stanzas 3–4) seems to concentrate on Athena, relating how Apollo received purification in Tempe (after the killing of Python) by the will of Zeus, and how Athena conveyed him to Delphi, where he persuaded Gaia and Themis to let him take over, in return for which he honours Athena at Delphi (stanza 4); in the third section various gods present Apollo with gifts (stanza 5),²⁴ and there is a concluding prayer, in which the speaking subject emerges as plural (stanza 6). To judge from the content, Aristonoos composed his song for the Delphic Septerion; Athena's role may point to Athenian influence.²⁵

(b) *The παῖάν at Delos*

Παῖάν-singing had an important part in the cult of Apollo at Delos, though this is less conspicuous because no παῖάνες on stone survive from Delos and because no aetiology links the παῖάν with Delos. One thinks first of the Deliades, a χορός of girls often represented as performing παῖάνες in honour of Apollo, first mentioned in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. From the fifth century BC we have some small fragments by Simonides which may come from Delian *Paianes*, e.g. *PMG* 519, fr. 55 (=R17).²⁶

tioned in the inscription: arguing for 338 BC, Daux (1942–3), 137–40; for 334 BC, de La Coste-Messelière (1949), 235–8 (see West (1970), 281 n. 3). This dating overrides the thesis of Crusius (1894), 26–8, that the author should be identified with the citharode Aristonoos, mentioned in *Plut. Lys.* 18. 5, and that the same Aristonoos of Corinth might be the author of the Corinthian παῖάν to the hero Agemon: see p. 49.

²³ The point of genre is discussed further on p. 92.

²⁴ Poseidon presents Apollo with ἀγνοῖς δαπέδοις, perhaps a reference to the myth that Poseidon originally held Delphi but exchanged it for Calauria: *Paus.* 2. 33. 2; 10. 5. 6; *Plut. Sump. probl.* 9. 6. 1, 741 A; *Call.* fr. 593 (perhaps from the *Aition* on the Delphic Septerion = fr. 86–9?); Vilatte (1988), 307 ff.

²⁵ Delphic Septerion: Weil (1893), 567; Fairbanks (1900), 115. Athenian influence: Crusius (1894), 24 ff. showed that the song shares features with the proem of Aesch. *Eum.* (24 ff.), suggesting that they might both have drawn on 'den wohl etwa im sechsten Jahrhundert durchgebildeten Kanon der delphischen Lehre'.

²⁶ Deliades: *HH Ap.* 157; *Eur. Her.* 687 ff.; Bruneau (1970), 215 ff. Simonides: Rutherford (1990), 177 ff. Delian traditions about the παῖάν: Bacch. 17 ends with young men and women performing παῖάνες and shouting δολογῇ when Theseus resurfaces; since *Ode* 17 is probably itself a παῖάν performed on Delos by a χορός from Ceos, the performance described at the end of the myth could be seen as providing a mythical antecedent for its own performance and genre; another Delian tradition about the παῖάν perhaps underlies *Hyperid. Del.* (fr. 69 Jensen) καὶ τὸν

(c) The παιάν at Sparta

The παιάν was well established in Spartan cults of Apollo. Several sources report its importance in the Huakinthia. The fullest is a fragment from the *Lakonika* of Polycrates, which Athenaeus transmits. This fragment makes the following points: (1) the sacrifice in honour of Hyacinthus was three days long; (2) there was a period of mourning for Hyacinthus, during which the παιάν to Apollo (an anonymous but perhaps traditional composition) was not sung; and (3) the second of the three days was characterized by joy, including 'singing in the gods' honour', i.e. singing the παιάν. The prima-facie interpretation is that the whole festival was three days long, the first day being sad, the second and third joyful. However, it has also been suggested that the three-day 'sacrifice in honour of Hyacinthus' and the period of mourning coincide, with the middle day somewhat less sombre than the first and third; and that this three-day period was followed by a further period of celebration, so that the festival as a whole will have been considerably longer than three days (one could compare the nine-day Karneia). But against this is the fact that the reference to 'singing in the god's honour' is most naturally taken as the singing of the παιάν to Apollo, which was not allowed during the period of mourning for Hyacinthus. So I adhere to the traditional interpretation that the Huakinthia was a three-day festival, a mournful first day and singing of the παιάν on the second and third.²⁷

Polycrates' account of the performance context of the παιάν is unusually detailed. The singers were children and they accompanied themselves on the κιθάρα and the αὐλός. The venue for the performance seems to have been a θέατρον at Amyclae: this is not explicitly mentioned in the case of the children's performance, but the subsequent events take place in the θέατρον, so we should probably assume that the children's performance took place there also. The παιάν was followed by a second choral performance: χοροί of young men enter the θέατρον singing ἐπιχώρια ποιήματα, and these

κρατῆρα τὸν παιώνιον (Usener: Πανιώνιον MSS) κοινῇ οἱ Ἕλληνες κεραννύουσιν ('The Greeks mix the healing-bowl in common').

²⁷ *FGrH* 588 F 1, cited via Didymus by Athen. 139 c; Xen. *Hell.* 4. 5. 11 (Amyclaeans often go the Huakinthia); Ages. 2. 17 (Agesilaos is assigned a position in the χορός at the festival); Mellink (1943); see the discussions of Dietrich (1975); Piccirilli (1967); Bruit (1990). Different forms of the three-day interpretation: Bölte (1929), 132 ff.; L. Ziehen, *RE* s.v. *Sparta* (*Kulte*), viA. 1518–20; Wide (1893), 290–1; Mellink (1943); the longer interpretation: Unger (1877).

are accompanied by dancers who seem to be scattered among the singers. If a contrast is intended between the ἐπιχώρια ποιήματα and the παῖάν to Apollo, this might have the implication that the παῖάν was a non-local and therefore panhellenic song, in which case we might expect it to be by a famous poet, which makes it all the stranger that it is anonymous.²⁸

At the Gumnopaidia, by contrast, songs or song-dances by famous poets were performed. Sources report that χοροί of boys, youths, and old men danced naked and sang songs (ᾄσματα) by Thaletas of Gortyn and Alcman and παιᾶνες by the otherwise unknown Dionysodotus the Laconian.²⁹ The festival was dedicated to Apollo Puthaieus as well as Leto and Artemis; and it was supposed to commemorate the dead who had fallen in a battle with Argos over the Thyreatis, possibly the Spartan defeat at Hysiai in 669 BC.³⁰ The cult of Apollo Puthaieus was specially associated with Asine, where it was administered by Argos and probably served as the centre of a local religious league. The sanctuary to Apollo Puthaieus at Asine, it may be observed, was the venue for the original performance of a *Paian* of Bacchylides (fr. 4 = R23).³¹

No specific evidence connects the Karneia with παιᾶνες, but the invocation to Apollo ἰὴ ἰὴ Καρνείε in Callimachus' *Hymn* 2 looks as if it might reflect a traditional form of address used at the Karneia or its Cyrenaean equivalent.³² In the second stasimon of Euripides'

²⁸ With these ἐπιχώρια ποιήματα compare the ὕμνοι ἐπιχώριοι ('local songs') that, according to Paus. 2. 7. 5, accompanied the ritual transportation of two images of Dionysus (Bakkheios and Lukos) from the κοσμητήριον at Sikyon to the temple of Dionysus there.

²⁹ Athen. 678 c; Strabo 10. 4. 18 mentions local dance and rhythms, παιᾶνες sung in accordance with tradition, and many other practices, all of which he says were called Cretan.

³⁰ See Calame (1977a), i. 353 n. 352; Wade-Gery (1949); Brelich (1961), 22 ff.; Paus. 3. 11. 9; *Suda* s.v. Γυμνοπαίδία (i. 547. 12 Adler); Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, i. 32. 18 ff.; some MSS at *EM* 243. 3 seem to point to a tradition that it commemorated the dead at Thermopylae.

³¹ The cult of Apollo Puthaieus at Asine: Vollgraff (1956); C. Morgan (1990), 11. On the League see Tausend (1992), 8 ff.; Barrett (1954) suggests that Bacch. fr. 4 might have been written for a χορός from Trozen. Spartan interest in the cult at Asine seems to be indicated by Diod. 12. 78; see Brelich (1961), 33.

³² Karneia: Wide (1893), 74 ff.; Aly (1908), 8 ff.; Calame (1977a), i. 351 ff.; H. von Geisau, *RE* xx. 1986–9 s.v. *Karneia*. Call. *Hymn* 2 as a παῖάν: pp. 128–30. Krummen (1990), 139–40, suggests that Pind. *Pyth.* 5 can be seen in part as a παῖάν written for the Cyrenaean Karneia: see §6 n. 28. Evidence for παιᾶνες at Cyrene is also provided by *SEC*, no. 80 = R69.

Alceſtis (445 ff.) the χορός imagine poets singing songs in honour of the dead Alceſtis at the Karneia; these lines could reflect actual singing of παῖάνες in honour of heroes at the Karneia, as we know they were sung at the Gumnopaidia. The point would presumably be that Alceſtis is worthy of being honoured as a man in death, unlike her feckless husband.³³

Surprisingly, the poets associated with these festivals are all from the seventh and sixth centuries BC; no fragment from a *Paian* by Pindar or any other classical poet can be traced to a Spartan context. This is partly to be explained by the fact that Spartan musical traditions were highly conservative and partly by the fact that the festivals were not international, so that there were no visiting delegations to commission songs.³⁴

(d) *Other centres*

Another centre of παῖάν-performance was Thebes. Thebes is well represented among the *Paianes* of Pindar (A1, D1, E1, F2, F3), and only part of the explanation for this is likely to be that the poet was a Theban. Other indications of Theban interest in the παῖάν are references in Statius' *Thebaid* and in Athenian tragedies that relate to Thebes. In addition, one of the Pindaric *Paianes* (D7) was performed at the neighbouring Ptoion, perhaps celebrating a Theban initiative there.³⁵

The surviving *Paian* of Bacchylides was performed in association with the cult of Apollo Puthaieus at Asine (R23); Ps.-Theognis attests the performance of παῖάνες at Megara; we have a fragment of a *Paian* by Simonides describing the birth of Artemis at Ephesus and perhaps performed there (R18); the Milesian Μολποί performed παῖάνες on the sacred way to Didyma (R42);³⁶ Pindar, D2, was performed in the area of Abdera.

The evidence for performance of Apolline παῖάνες at Athens is slim—surprisingly, since we know of numerous παῖάν-performances

³³ C. R. Robert (1879) suggested that the story originated in the Karneia. Demetrius of Scepsis (Athen. 141 E–F = fr. 1 in Gaede (1880)) described the festival as a μῖμημα . . . στρατιωτικῆς ἀγωγῆς ('imitation of military training'), and it no doubt had an initiatory dimension.

³⁴ Pindar may have composed ὑπορχήματα for Sparta: particularly fr. 112 Λάκωνα μὲν παρθένων ἀγέλα ('a Spartan troop of virgins'). See also pp. 99–101.

³⁵ *Theb.* 8. 224, 10. 306 ('Sidonium paeana'); the references in tragedy (on which see §10) are Soph. *OT* 151 ff.; Aesch. *Sept.* 288 ff.; Eur. *Her.* 687 ff.

³⁶ Megara: *Theognid.* 776; Simonides and Ephesus: *PMG* 519, fr. 32; the Milesian Μολποί: p. 61.

by Athenians abroad. Phrynichus of Athens wrote παιᾶνες; and they are more likely to have been Apolline than not. Performances of song-dance by both men and boys are attested for the Athenian Thargelia, and we might expect the songs performed at this Apolline festival to have included παιᾶνες, though our sources are not specific about the genre. Certainly, the profile of the παιάν was much less conspicuous in Athens than that of the διθύραμβος and state drama, except on the occasion of pilgrimage to the great sanctuaries of Apollo.³⁷

Apolline παιᾶνες may have been performed in Rome also. A Sibylline oracle, perhaps Augustan in origin, lays down regulations for the Ludi Saeculares, among them 'Latin παιᾶνες' to be performed by boys and girls in honour of a number of gods, including Apollo-Helios. Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, which is mostly devoted to the praise of Apollo and Diana, could be considered an example of a 'Latin παιάν'.³⁸

(e) Παιᾶνες and pilgrimage

In (a)–(d) above I tried to concentrate on παιᾶνες performed at sanctuaries of Apollo by local χοροί. But many παιᾶνες were performed by visiting χοροί accompanying θεωρίαι.³⁹ At Delphi the original Cretan singers of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* are the original pilgrims, though unusually they stay. Simonides, *PMG* 519, fr. 35 (b), 12–13 (R16), may be the start of a *Paian* performed in association with a θεωρία from Andros to Delphi (a treaty establishing relations between Andros and Delphi survives from the fifth century BC); another fragment of a Simonidean *Paian* may relate to the θεωρία from Athens to Delphi known as the Puthais (R15).⁴⁰ Some

³⁷ Phrynichus of Athens: Athen. 250 B = *TrGF* i. 3 Phrynichus T11 = Timaeus, *FGH* 566 F 32. The song that Pantacles wrote for the Thargelia (R48) may have been a παιάν. For the point that the songs performed at the Thargelia included παιᾶνες see Badensteiner (1891), 48, though others, including Bottin (1930–1), 763 ff. think that they would have been διθύραμβοι. Another παιάν attested for Athens is the victory παιάν that Sophocles performed after Salamis (§5 n. 40).

³⁸ Phlegon of Tralles, *Περὶ Μακροβίων*, 37. 5 (*FGrH* 257 F 37); cf. Zosimus, *Hist.* 2. 6; see Fraenkel (1957), 365; Gagé (1955), 630.

³⁹ On θεωρία: Ziehen (1934); Bill (1901); Rausch (1982); Siebart (1983); Redfield (1985); Motte (1987), 111 ff. I draw attention to the important reference in S3. 36–7.

⁴⁰ For the Andrian παιάν see Rutherford (1990), 176 ff.; the inscription (*LSCGS* no. 38, *CID* i, no. 7) tells us that the personnel in a typical θεωρία from Andros to Delphi included an αὐλητής and a κελευστής, either of whom might have been involved in παιάν-singing (for the κελευστής see §4 n. 13). For the Athenian παιάν see Rutherford (1990), 171 ff.

have supposed that Pindar, D6, was performed in association with a *θεωρία* from Aegina to Delphi. The performance of such theoric *παιᾶνες* need not have coincided with the major Delphic festivals.

Our most detailed information about *θεωρία*i to Delphi comes from the inscriptions relating to the four revivals of the Athenian Puthais which were staged in the late second and early first centuries BC.⁴¹ These preserve lists of participants, including *τεχνῖται Διονύσου* and other singers, and also two songs sung on these occasions. The inscription to the second of these songs attributes it to a certain Limenios son of Thoinos, and we have reason to associate this with Puthais 2 of 129 BC (R66).⁴² The inscription to the first is damaged, but it seems to attribute the song to a certain Athenaios, and it is likely that it too was performed in 129 BC (R67).⁴³ These celebrations of the Puthais, which probably took place in the Athenian month of Thargelion, cannot be shown to have coincided with the celebration of any particular Delphic festivals.⁴⁴

Though late, these Delphic *παιᾶνες* deserve our attention as unusually well-preserved representatives of the genre. Limenios' composition is introduced in the title as a *παῖαν δὲ καὶ π[ροσόδιον]*, and these terms seem to refer to different parts of it.⁴⁵ The *παιάν* is the main part of the song, in cretic-paeonic metre and consisting of nine sections, which may be meant to fall into two triads.⁴⁶ Section (1) begins with an appeal to the Muses, then goes on to describe the birth of Apollo; subsequent sections describe reactions of na-

⁴¹ Puthais 1: *SIG* 696 (*FD* iii/2, nos. 7, 11, 23, 29); Puthais 2: *SIG* 697 (*FD* iii/2, nos. 3, 8, 12, 24, 27, 35-42); Puthais 3: *SIG* 711 (*FD* iii/2, nos. 4, 5, 9, 13-14, 25, 28, 30, 43-4, 47, 48, 51); Puthais 4: *SIG* 728 (*FD* iii/2, nos. 2, 6, 10, 16, 17, 26, 31-2, 45, 49, 257).

⁴² *SIG* 698C; *FD* iii/2, no. 138; Bélis, *CID* iii. The date is discussed by Pöhlmann (1970), 64; Daux (1936), 521 ff., 584 ff., 708 ff.

⁴³ *SIG* 698B; *FD* iii/2, no. 137. The identification of the author as 'Athenaios' (i.e. ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ should be read *Ἀθήναιος*, not *Ἀθηναῖος*) was made by Bélis (1988), who uses this as a reason for dating it to 129 BC, since an Athenaios son of Athenaios is mentioned in an inscription listing singers in the Puthais of that year.

⁴⁴ For the date of the Puthais see Boethius (1918), 20 ff.; Rutherford (1990), 174. Weil (1893), 579, thought that Limenios' song might have been performed at the Soteria, set up by the Aetolians after the attack of the Gauls in 278 BC, but this probably took place in Aug.-Sept. (see Nachtergaele (1977), 390); Crusius (1894), 65 ff. argued for the Theoxenia, but this is too early. Fairbanks (1900), 127 ff. thought of a general summer festival at Delphi, coinciding with the notional birth of Apollo.

⁴⁵ The pattern *παιάν* followed by *προσόδιον* recurs in the two sections of D6: see below, pp. 323-4, 329-30.

⁴⁶ Moens suggested that 1=strophe 1, 2-3=antistrophe 1, 4-5=epode 1, 6-7=strophe 2, 8=antistrophe 2, 9=epode 2.

ture to the birth (2), the journey of the young god to Athens (3), his reception there to the accompaniment of local music (4), ending with a self-identification by the Athenian *τεχνῖται* (5). Note that, according to Limenios, Apollo receives the name 'Paieon' before he reaches Delphi, so that the Pythoetonia aetiology is pre-empted.⁴⁷ Section (6), which may introduce the second triad, contains an appeal to Apollo to approach the temple, moving on to an account of how, when he was laying the foundations of the temple, he encountered (7) and slew the Delphic dragon, and also Tityos when he threatened Leto (8). This second triad seems to have concluded by mentioning how Apollo drove off the Gauls (9). The two cretic-paeonic triads are followed by a concluding prayer in aeolic (10); this section is presumably the *προσόδιον* referred to in the title.

The surviving part of Athenaios' *παιάν* has four sections: (1) an appeal to the Muses (lines 1–8); (2) a description of the Athenian singers (lines 9–16); (3) an account of how Apollo slew Python (lines 16–20); (4) comparison with how Apollo drove off the Gauls (lines 21 ff.), referring to the attack of 278 BC. It is thus considerably simpler than Limenios' Delphic *παιάν*. The part of the title that would have revealed the genre is in this case unfortunately lost.⁴⁸ There is no sign of a change of metre or genre in the extant fragment (as there is in Limenios' *παιάν*), but this may have come in the badly damaged conclusion of the song.⁴⁹

At Delos visiting *χοροί* also performed *παῖνες*, though the first such song we hear of—by Eumelus of Corinth and composed for the Messenians—is identified as a *προσόδιον* in our source. Examples from the fifth century BC include D5, probably composed for the Athenians to be performed at Delos, and G1, perhaps composed for the Naxians to be performed at Delos. In addition, we know of a *προσόδιον* by Pronomus (R31). Pindar, C2, was also performed at Delos, though the nationality of the performers eludes us. Bacchylides, *Ode* 17, classed in the Hellenistic edition as a *Dithuram-*

⁴⁷ The half-line relating to the aetiology is lost; I suggest that 'Echo' addressed Apollo as Ἠ παῖ, the same device which was used in the Pythoetonia aetiology. 'Echo' is a divine voice (as at Eur. *Hipp.* 1201), not an 'echo' (as at Aesch. *Per.* 389–91): see Fairbanks (1900), 135. See further p. 345 on D9.

⁴⁸ The original editors suggested ᾠσμα μετὰ κιθάρας ('song with the κιθάρα'), but Pöhlmann (1970), 58, more recently proposed παιάν καὶ ὑπόρχημα followed by Bélis (1988).

⁴⁹ Moens thought that the final section might have been in glyconics like the final section of Limenios' *παιάν*, but this does not fit exactly, as Pöhlmann pointed out.

bos, may in fact be a Delian *παιάν* performed by Ceians. One of the Pindaric *Paianes*, D4, may also have been performed by Ceians on Delos, although another possibility is that it was performed on Ceos (perhaps at the moment when Ceian *θεωροί* left for Delos). With the apparent exception of Eumelus' Messenians, all the performers are Ionian: the catchment area for Delos was mainly Ionia at this period.⁵⁰

5. OTHER FUNCTIONS

Not all paeanic song-dance performances were directly and exclusively related to Apolline cult. In this section I present a repertoire of ten such non-Apolline performance scenarios. All of these are attested in the classical period, with the exception of category (j), which seems to develop in the fourth century.

(a) *Apotropaic prayer*

Besides being used in the context of prayer and worship, the force of the *παιάν* was often apotropaic, particularly in the context of natural disaster. Xenophon (*Hell.* 4. 7. 4) tells how Agesipolis was dining in the territory of Argos when after dinner, just as the libations had been poured, there was an earthquake, whereupon the Spartans sang *τὸν περὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶν παιᾶνα* (the *παιάν* concerning Poseidon), Poseidon being the god of earthquakes. The phrase suggests that this was a ready-made song available to Spartans to be used on the occasion of earthquakes. Of the surviving *Paianes* of Pindar, A1, the first part of which is a prayer to avert the effects of an eclipse, belongs in this category, though I would describe it not as an immediate response to danger but as a quasi-dramatic imitation of such a response performed in the context of a religious festival. Few other apotropaic *παιάνες* survive. One candidate from much later is Hor. *Odes*, 1. 2 (R73), a song that purports to be an apotropaic response to bad weather in winter, and is related to the apotropaic *παιάν*, though it lacks the formal features (such as an appeal to a help-providing god as 'Paian'). Another early example is provided by Greek tragedy. The parodos of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* (151 ff.), in which the *χοροί* express anxiety about the

⁵⁰ Eumelus: *PMG* 696; see Bowra (1963a). Pronomus: *PMG* 767 = Paus. 9. 12. 6; see p. 297. Bacch. 17: see pp. 98–9. Eumelus' Messenians: it has been suggested that they may have been temporarily exiled in Chalcis: see Bowra (1963a).

plague, and about the message from Apollo that Creon has brought from Delphi, is meant to suggest the *παῖάν*.¹

The scope of the apotropaic *παῖάν* was probably broader than natural disasters, encompassing the effects of man-made catastrophes also. The *παῖάν* sung before battle (§5c) could be seen as a special case of an apotropaic *παῖάν* also. A late source tells us that *παῖανες* were sung to avert the effects of *στάσις* as well as plague, and *στάσις* is one of the disasters mentioned in Pindar, A1. 15. A related theme found in some *παῖανες* is the celebration of civil and domestic peace. Some sources, e.g. Philochorus (fr. 172), associated the *παῖάν* with order, and distinguished it from the excited and by implication disorderly *διθύραμβος*.²

A special apotropaic function was associated with purification and healing; it is emblematic of this association that in the *Iliad* Paieon is a healing deity, and that the Greeks sing and dance a purificatory *παῖάν* to stop the plague. Thaletas of Gortyn was supposed to have composed a *παῖάν* to purify Sparta of a plague.³ The best surviving example of a healing *παῖάν* may be the so-called *παῖάν* to Health (*PMG* 813 = R30) of Ariphron of Sicyon (late fifth century BC). This song has a simple structure: a two-part prayer (roughly

¹ Aesch. *Ag.* 146; Soph. *OT* 1096; Eur. *Her.* 820; *Alc.* 92, 220; *IT* 1403–4; Ar. *Ach.* 1212. In late sources *παῖάν* and *ἡ παῖάν* are sometimes derived from the verb *παύω*, with the implication that a *παῖάν* stops something bad; see p. 14 n. 17. The apotropaic function is stressed in Proclus' account of the genre at *Chrest.* 320^a21–5, cited on p. 105. Notice, however, that the stress on the apotropaic function implied there is a corollary of the fact that Proclus or his source wanted to dissociate the *παῖάν* from Apollo (Apollo's genre is the *νόμος*). Hor. *Odes*, 1. 2: Cairns (1971); Fairbanks (1900), 14 ff.; von Blumenthal (1943), 2350. Soph. *OT*, parodos: Ax (1932). That the song is a *παῖάν* is suggested by the quasi-refrain in line 154: *ἡῖε Δάλιε Παῖάν* ('*ieie Delian Paian*') and by line 184: *παῖάν δὲ λάμπει στονόεσσά τε γῆρυσ ὄμανλος* ('the *παῖάν* flashes, and the mournful voice accompanying it'). The implied function—prayer for deliverance from plague—is also typically paeanic. The range of deities invoked is wider than we would normally expect in a *παῖάν*: Athena, Artemis, and Apollo (first antistrophe), Zeus (third strophe), Dionysus (third antistrophe).

² Dion. Thrax, 451. 12–13 Hilgard *παῖάν ἐστι ποίημα πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν, (περὶ) ἔχει προσφώνησιν ἐπὶ παρατήσει λοιμῶν ἢ στάσεων ἢ τῶν παραπλησίων* ('The *παῖάν* is a poem in honour of Apollo and Artemis, and it contains a request for relief from plagues, civil strife, or similar things'). The theme of peace and political stability in *Paianes* is found in Pindar, D1; and the conclusion of Bacch. fr. 4 (65 ff.). The same theme occurs in *PMG* 1018(b), a prayer to the Moirai, a factor which suggests that this fragment might be from a *παῖάν* (perhaps from the 5th cent. BC); see Bowra (1958), 234–5. Later, Plutarch associated the *παῖάν* with peace: see *De E ap. Delph.* 389 B, cited on p. 82.

³ Purificatory *παῖάν*: Hom. *Il.* 1. 472–4. Paieon in the *Iliad*: see p. 15. Thaletas of Gortyn: p. 31.

'May I live with you, may you live with me'), followed by a justification of the value of health expressed in a long sentence, with a closural effect produced by a short antithesis to this: 'Without you no one has enjoyed fortune'.⁴

The chanting of the παιάν-cry may have been a common response to illness. Aelius Aristides describes how he and his comrades sang the παιάν (perhaps the simple παιάν-cry) after he emerged from a healing bath. The παιάνες he composed for Asclepius could be regarded as a form of self-therapy.⁵ Psychiatric illness could be treated by παιάνες also: Iamblichus, *Vita Pyth.* 25. 110. 8, mentions the therapeutic use of the παιάν by Pythagoras. Another text seems to report that according to Aristoxenus' *Life of Telestes*, after an epidemic of insanity among the women of Locri the Delphic oracle recommended the singing of twelve 'spring' παιάνες each day for sixty days.⁶

μαντευομένοις δὲ τοῖς Λοκροῖς καὶ Ῥηγίοις περὶ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ πάθους εἰπεῖν τὸν θεὸν παιάνας ἄδειν ἑαρινούς δώδεκα τῆς ἡμέρας (ἐπὶ ἡμέρας) ξ'. ὁθεν πολλοὺς γενέσθαι παιανογράφους ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ.

(The Locrians and Rhegians consulted the god about relief from the illness and the god told them to sing twelve spring paeans each day for sixty days. This is the reason why there are many paeon-writers in Italy.)

The significance of the stipulation that the παιάνες had to be sung in the spring (if the text is right) is not clear. The idea may have been to correlate the ritual with Apollo's springtime return from the Hyperboreans.⁷

(b) The cult of Asclepius

It is a short transition to the use of παιάν in the cult of Asclepius, attested from the fifth century BC. The first poet known to have

⁴ Athen. 701 F–702 B calls it a παιάν. It is attested also in *IG* ii/2. 4533 (Athens, 3rd cent. AD) and in *IG* iv/12. 132 (Epidauros, 4th cent. BC). Ariphron's date is also indicated by *IG* ii/2. 3092, in which he appears as a producer; see Bottin (1930–1), 14. The song is discussed by Maas (1933), 148 ff.; Keyssner (1933), drawing attention to numerous hymnic features, e.g. the final antithesis (discussed in Keyssner (1932), 29 ff.), and showing parallels with Likymnios' song to health (*PMG* 769).

⁵ *Hier. log.* 2 (48). 53; cf. Arr. *Disc. Epict.* 3. 10. 4. Self-therapy: the παιάν on the marriage of Coronis and the birth of Asclepius: *Hier. log.* 1 (47). 73 (Wilamowitz (1886), 84 n. 80); also the παιάν beginning φορμίγγων ἄνακτα Παῖα να κληῖσω ('I shall invoke Paian, lord of the φόρμιγγες'): *Hier. log.* 4 (50). 31 (I connect this with the toothache described in s. 30) = *GDRK* S2. 3.

⁶ Aristox. fr. 117 Wehrli = Apollon. *Mir.* 40. 1. 53. 9 ff. Keller; for the text see West (1990). The text remains problematic, particularly the use of the word ἑαρινούς, where one would expect ἦρι.

⁷ For spring παιάνες see p. 54.

composed a *παῖάν* to Asclepius is the tragedian Sophocles, who according to later tradition took the lead in establishing the god's cult at Athens.⁸ A Sophoclean *παῖάν* to Asclepius is known to have been employed in cult at Athens in the second and third centuries AD.⁹ The start of the '*Παῖάν* of Sophocles' is preserved on the left side of the Sarapion monument (perhaps from the early years of the third century AD), and there can be no doubt that it is in honour of Asclepius (R28).¹⁰ The erectors of the Sarapion monument may have intended this song for choral performance, since the right side of the monument contains a list of *παιανισταί*.¹¹

Another classical *παῖάν* to Asclepius is attested first in Erythrae (CA 136-7 = PMG 934; the inscription is dated to 386-360 BC), where this and two other *παῖᾶνες* form part of the ritual accompanying a thank-offering following incubation; for this reason it is usually called the Erythraean *παῖάν* to Asclepius.¹² The same song is attested later in slightly different versions also from Athens, from the sanctuary of Dion in Macedonia, and from Ptolemais in Egypt (R43):¹³

α' [Παῖᾶνα κλυτό]μητιν αἰείσατε
κούροι [Λατοῖδαν ἔκ]ατον,
ἰὲ παῖάν,

⁸ Sources in *TrGF* iv. T67-9; see Henrichs (1985), 298 ff.; Lefkowitz (1981), 83 ff.; Lehnus (1980), 21 ff.

⁹ Philostr. *VA* 3. 17. 4 ὁ παῖάν τοῦ Σοφοκλέους ὃν Ἀθήνησι τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ ᾄδουσιν ('the *παῖάν* of Sophocles, which they sing at Athens in honour of Asclepius'); ps.-Luc. *Dem. Enc.* 27. iii. 274 Macleod οὐδὲ γὰρ τᾷσκληπιῷ μείον τι γίνεται τῆς τιμῆς, εἰ μὴ τῶν προσιόντων αὐτῶν ποιησάντων ὁ παῖάν Ἰσοδήμου τοῦ Τροϊζηνίου καὶ Σοφοκλέους ᾄδεται ('Nor is there less honour for Asclepius if the *παῖάν* of Isodemus of Troezen or of Sophocles is sung, those approaching him not having composed one of their own'). Note also that *Suda* s.v. *Σοφοκλῆς* (iv. 402. 2 Adler), lists *παῖᾶνες* among his works.

¹⁰ PMG 737(b); see SEG xxviii. 225, with full bibliography on dating the inscription; on Sarapion see Jones (1978). On the front of the monument are inscribed two poems by Sarapion (see also p. 145), one a philosophical poem on the duties of doctors (see Oliver (1949)), and the other apparently a *παῖάν* performed in the archonship of Munatius Vopiscus in AD 174/5 (see p. 42); the right side of the monument contains a list of the *παιανισταί* who sang the poem on that occasion.

¹¹ Käppel (1992b), 367, tentatively associates with Sophocles' *παῖάν* two dactylic lines cited by Clement (= *TrGF* ii, adesp. F 621). For a full picture of Sophocles' engagement with the *παῖάν* genre one should bear in mind (1) *παῖᾶνες* in his tragedies (see §10) and (2) the victory *παῖάν* he is supposed to have led after Salamis (see §5 n. 40).

¹² Graf (1985), 250 ff.

¹³ See Oliver (1936); on different versions see von Bülow (1929). Käppel (1992b), 372, has more recent bibliography; Bernand (1969a), no. 176, gives the version from Ptolemais; also §7 n. 6. For Ptolemais and the *παῖάν* see now Rutherford (2000b).

Isodemus of Trozen (R47; there is some uncertainty about the name), the other to Sophocles; so the author of the Erythraean *παιάν* might be one of these. Philostratus attributes to Sophocles a *παιάν* in which Asclepius was called *κλυτόμητις*.¹⁴ Now, this epithet is applied to Apollo in the first line of the Erythraean *παιάν*. Is Philostratus perhaps right about the adjective but wrong about its application, in which case is the Erythraean *παιάν* by Sophocles?¹⁵

From the early third century BC we have a *παιάν* to Apollo and Asclepius by Isyllus of Epidauros (*IG* iv/2. 128; *CA* 133-4).¹⁶ This song presents an Epidaurian version of the genealogy and birth of Asclepius: he is descended from the hero Malos, who established the cult of Apollo Maleatas.¹⁷ Malos fathered Cleophema on the Muse Erato. Cleophema married Phlegyas of Epidauros, and their daughter was called Aigle or Coronis.¹⁸ She was deflowered by Apollo and gave birth in his *τέμενος*. The Moirai attend the birth, just as Lachesis attends in Pindar's account of the birth of Apollo (G1) and the Moirai in Pindar's account of the birth of Iamos (*Ol.* 6. 42 ff.). Apollo named the son Asclepius after Aigle (a unique derivation).¹⁹

Roughly contemporary with Isyllus' *παιάν* is the fourth *Mimiambus* of the Hellenistic poet Herodas, a representation of a visit by two women to the Asclepium in Cos. Sections of this song (lines 1 ff., 79 ff.) echo the cult *παιάν* to Asclepius.

Probably somewhat later—the inscription is of the imperial period, though the song need not be as late as that—is a *παιάν* to Asclepius dedicated in the temple of Asclepius and Athena at Athens by Macedonicus of Amphipolis (R100).²⁰ The metre of the song is

¹⁴ Philost. *Im.* 415. 7 Kaiser (describing Sophocles) Ἀσκληπιὸς δ', οἶμαι, οὗτος παιανὰ που παρεγγυῶν γράφειν καὶ κλυτόμητ(ι)ς οὐκ ἀπαξίων παρὰ σοῦ ἀκοῦσαι, βλέμμα τε αὐτοῦ πρὸς σέ φαιδρότητι μεμιγμένον τὰς (παρὰ) μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐπιξενώσεσι αἰνίττεται ('This is Asclepius, I think, nearby, urging you to write a paean, and not refusing to be called "famed for his skill" by you; and his radiant gaze in your direction suggests his subsequent visits to you').

¹⁵ Cf. Oliver (1936), 121-2. For Käppel's thesis that the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius is an example of 'generic automation' see §12 n. 6.

¹⁶ See Wilamowitz (1886); Tomlinson (1983), 14.

¹⁷ This point is made in the short poem that makes up section C of the inscription.

¹⁸ The second name Coronis is given to her because of her beauty: see Wilamowitz (1886) on this point.

¹⁹ Aigle is perhaps related to Asclas, a mythical king of Epidauros, whose name is very similar to that of Asclepius; this hypothesis makes the etymology easier: Wilamowitz (1886), 91-3; Burkert (1992), 75-7.

²⁰ The name of the author was previously believed to be Macedonius, but a

dactylic, and there is a fairly regular *παιάν*-refrain. It begins with an invocation to Apollo (1–6), followed by a description of Asclepius (7–11) and his children (12–15), and concludes with a prayer to the god to bestow blessings on the singers (the Athenian *παιανισταί*?) and on Athens. Similarities to the *παιάν* of Sophocles and the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius are perhaps to be explained as imitations of these specific models rather than as exploitation of common generic features.²¹

Another later *παιάν* to Asclepius is that of Sarapion, inscribed on the lower half of the front of the inscription that bears his name, performed in AD 174–5; only the first letters of the lines survive (R79).²² A further Athenian inscription, also of the imperial period, the so-called Cassel-stone, transmits four *παιᾶνες*: the first is a short anonymous *παιάν* to Asclepius in hexameters; the second is Aripbron's *παιάν* to Health; the third and fourth, both anonymous, are dedicated to Telesphorus, the son of Asclepius, the third in anapaests and the fourth again in hexameters. While the second song is classical, neither the first nor the third need be much older than the inscription.²³ Late inscriptions containing a series of cult hymns are also known from Epidauros; one (*IG* iv/i(2). 132–4) contains Aripbron's *παιάν* as well as a hymn to Asclepius, probably a *παιάν*, and a hymn to Athena. The third of these is given the heading ὥρα τρίτη, which presumably means that it is to be performed at the third hour, so that we can infer that the first two hymns were to be performed at the first and second hours.²⁴

(c) *Military contexts (1): Before battle*

A context which shares with the apotropaic *παιάν* at least the confrontation with danger is the chanting of the *παιάν* by armies before battle.²⁵ Secondary sources (which, as often, are our only evidence)

new fragment, published first in 1968 by A. G. Woodhead (*SEG* xxiii. 126 = Peek, 45), has given us the right side of the title and of the first 8 lines. Though the inscription seems to date from the imperial period, spelling conventions (absence of ι in the original long diphthongs αι, ηι, ωι; ει for ι) indicate a date of the 1st cent. BC (Pordomingo Pardo (1984), 121 ff.), and the poem itself could of course be earlier. Possible identifications of Macedonicus are discussed by Pordomingo Pardo, 107–8.

²¹ See Pordomingo Pardo (1984), 126 ff.

²² For the date see *SEG* xxviii. 225.

²³ Ed. J. Kirchner, *IG* ii/2. 4533. This inscription was also edited as 'C' by Maas (1933); Maas distinguishes five poems, dividing Kirchner's fourth into two.

²⁴ For the performance of *παιᾶνες* at dawn see p. 54.

²⁵ Pritchett (1971–91), i. 105 ff.; Fairbanks (1900), 19 ff.

imply that this could happen at various points in an attack: immediately before the engagement; at a slightly earlier point before sacrifices had been made or omens taken; or again at the start of a campaign, well before the risk of combat (e.g. the *παιᾶνες* performed when the Athenian fleet set off for Sicily).²⁶ Aeneas Tacticus recommends that an army sing the *παιάν* to avert panic.²⁷ The performance of battle-*παιᾶνες* was usually antiphonal, with a leader (perhaps a general) starting the performance (the verb is *ἐξάρχω*) and the army answering with a *παιάν*-cry (the verb is *συνεπηχέω*).²⁸ The pre-battle *παιάν* was distinguished from the cry of *ἀλαλαί* or *ἐλελεῦ*, which was regarded as an invocation to Enualios.²⁹ Some late sources suggest that the pre-battle *παιάν* was dedicated to Ares or Enualios as well, but there is no classical evidence for this.³⁰ However, the Mycenaean tablet that links Enualios with the deity Paiawon shows how old the association between these two military deities may be.³¹

In contexts where Greek fights non-Greek the pre-battle *παιάν* was thought of as being a distinctively Greek mode of symbolic expression, as we can see from the anecdote at the start of Herodotus, bk. 5, concerning a strange event that he relates took place in the course of a military conflict between Greek Perinthians and the non-Greek Paeonians. The Paeonians had received an oracle instructing them not to attack until they should hear their name called. While they waited, the two sides arranged for duels to

²⁶ Immediately before the engagement: Xen. *Ana.* 4. 3. 29, 31; *Cyr.* 3. 3. 58–9. Before sacrifices had been made or omens taken: Xen. *Ana.* 4. 3. 19; 5. 2. 14. At the start of a campaign: Thuc. 6. 32. 2; cf. the end of D2.

²⁷ Aen. Tact. 27; p. 12 n. 8.

²⁸ See Xen. *Cyr.* 3. 3. 58, 7. 1. 25. Antiphonal performance is discussed on pp. 66–7. At Aen. Tact. 27 the term for the reply is *ἀντιπαιανίζω*.

²⁹ See p. 20.

³⁰ ΣThuc. 1. 50 δύο παιᾶνας ἦδον οἱ Ἕλληνες, πρὸ μὲν τοῦ πολέμου τῷ Ἄρει, μετὰ δὲ τὸν πόλεμον τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ('The Greeks sang two *παιᾶνες*, one before war in honour of Ares, the other after war in honour of Apollo'); Σ4. 43 δύο παιᾶνες ἦσαν, Ἐννάλιος, ὅτε ἤρχον, ὃς καὶ πρὸ τῆς μάχης ἐγένετο, καὶ ἕτερος, ὅτε ἐνίκων ('There were two *παιᾶνες*, Enualios, when they started, which also happened before battle, and another, when they won'); Julian, *Or.* 1. 36B ἐφευγε καρτερῶς ἐκπλαγεῖς τὸν κτύπον τῶν ὅπλων, οὐδὲ τὸν ἐννάλιον παιᾶνα τῶν στρατοπέδων ἐπαλαλαζόντων ἀδεῶς ἀκούων ('He fled, extremely frightened by the sound of the weapons and not even able to hear the army shout the "Enualios Paian" without becoming afraid'). Lonis (1979), 118 ff. argues in support of the view that the pre-battle *παιάν* was sung in honour of Enualios, and that it can be denoted by the verb *ἐλελίζω*, but the *παιάν* and the war-cry are distinguished at Xen. *Ana.* 5. 2. 14; *Hell.* 2. 4. 17. Lonis, 120, points to Ar. *Peace*, 453–8, where it seems to be implied that a *παιάν*-cry in the context of sacrifice could be offered to Ares and Enualios among other deities, but evidence pertaining to a sacrificial *παιάν*-cry can shed no light on the nature of a battle-*παιάν*.³¹ See p. 14.

be fought between dogs and horses belonging to the two sides. When the Perinthian animals won, the Perinthians celebrated the victory by singing the παιάν. The Paeonians supposed that the sound signified their own name, and then, launching an attack, they won a great victory. The premiss of the story is that the Paeonians had no familiarity with the παιάν.³² Similarly, Strabo reports that the παιάν-cry was called *τιτανισμός* among the Thracians, implying that they did not know the παιάν at all.³³ And in general non-Greek armies are only very rarely described as singing the παιάν.³⁴

The practice of different Greek *ἔθνη* with respect to the pre-battle παιάν displays considerable variation. Thus, according to Thucydides the Athenians who fought in Sicily were confused when their Dorian allies sang the παιάν before battle, which made the Athenians think that their Dorian enemies were about to attack them, and this contributed to their defeat. This anecdote presupposes that Athenian (or more generally Ionian) practice was different; they sang either a different form or none at all.³⁵ A distinctive Spartan form was the so-called marching-παιάν (*ἐμβατήριος παιάν*),³⁶ one instance of which may be partly preserved (R36):

ἄγετ' ὦ Σπάρτας εὐάνδρου
 κούροι πατέρων πολιητῶν,
 λαῖᾱ μὲν ἔτυν προβάλεσθε,
 δόρυ δ' εὐτόλμως πάλλοντες,
 μὴ φειδόμενοι τᾶς ζωᾶς.
 οὐ γὰρ πάτριον τᾷ Σπάρτᾳ.

(Come, O boys of Sparta, rich in men, of citizen fathers, thrust forward your shield with your left hand, shaking your spear with courage, and not sparing your life. For it is not the ancestral custom of Sparta.)

³² Her. 5. 1. On the dubious historicity of the episode see now Asheri (1990), 155–6.

³³ Strabo 7, fr. 40.

³⁴ Plut. *Them.* 8. 1; Lys. 2. 38; Plato, *Ep.* VII, 348 B. Strabo attributes παιάν-singing to Cantabrians (3. 4. 18) and to Ichthyophagi (16. 4. 13). The transmitted text at Ael. *Arist. Or.* 37. 18 (*Hymn to Athena*) says that according to τὸν Ἑλλήνων παιᾶνα ('the παιάν of the Greeks') Athena assisted in the birth of Apollo and Artemis and crowned the infant Apollo, but a reference to a παιάν by a specific author would be more appropriate. Wilamowitz (1916), 451 n. 1, suggested the emendation τὸν Ὠλήνος παιᾶνα ('the παιάν of Olen')—see Jöhrens (1981), 130, 294, n. 657; but would Aristides have had access to this? What we really need is an Athenian poet, who would have emphasized the role of Athena (cf. Pind. G1. 11); I would suggest τὸν Λιμηνίου παιᾶνα, assuming that Limenios composed a Delian παιάν as well as the surviving Delphian one.

³⁵ Thuc. 7. 44. 6.

³⁶ The term occurs at Plut. *Lyc.* 22, 2.

I would suggest that these lines represent part of the section sung by the ἐξάρχων, and that they were followed by a communal παιάν-cry sung by the army as a whole, which is not represented in the text.

(d) *Military contexts (2): After victory, ἐπινίκιος παιάν*³⁷

The earliest reference to a victory παιάν comes in Homer, *Il.* 22. 391–4, where the Greeks sing a παιάν over the dead Hector. Homer never mentions a pre-battle παιάν, which may suggest that the victory παιάν is the older form. However, it can be argued that Homer omitted the pre-battle παιάν out of choice, perhaps because its communal nature did not suit the individualism of his battle-scenes, or because the impact of the two references to παιᾶνες in the *Iliad* (the other at 1. 472–4), both at highly significant moments in the story, depends precisely on these references being rare.

Victory παιᾶνες were performed in a number of semi-ritual contexts: at the moment after battle when the victorious side erected a τρόπαιον on the battlefield;³⁸ in the course of the army's return to its base-camp (like the performance envisaged in *Il.* 22. 391–4);³⁹ and at a feast after victory.⁴⁰ In the case of a sea battle they could be performed by the victorious sailors while still on the ship—perhaps the chants of ἰὴ παιάν will have been synchronized with the movement of the oars, while the κελευστής, playing the role of the ἐξάρχων, shouted a cue or sang a solo part in between.⁴¹ Defeated armies seem to have avoided the παιάν entirely, and Strabo reports as a gesture of extreme defiance the story that some captured Cantabrians kept singing it even after the Romans had crucified them.⁴²

³⁷ For the term ἐπινίκιος παιάν see Plut. *Rom.* 16. 5; *Aem.* 34. 4; *Marc.* 8. 4; *Mar.* 20. 1.

³⁸ Xen. *Hell.* 7. 2. 15; Tim. *Per.* 196 ff.

³⁹ Diod. 20. 16. 4; Arr. *Ana.* 7. 11. 7.

⁴⁰ Xen. *Hell.* 7. 2. 23; *Cyr.* 4. 1. 7; παιάν-singing is supposed to have been part of the Athenian celebration after the battle of Salamis (interestingly, the young Sophocles was involved): *Vita Soph.* 3 (*TrGF* iv. 31) μετὰ λύρας γυμνὸς ἀληλμμένος τοῖς παιανίζουσι τῶν ἐπινικίων ἐξήρχε ('Naked and anointed he led off the victory-song with the λύρα for those singing the παιάν'); Athen. 20 F; see also Rutherford (1990), 199 ff.

⁴¹ Rowers chant the παιάν-cry at Thuc. 2. 91. 2. Similarly, at Opp. *Hal.* 5. 294 (cf. 300) successful fishermen sing the victory παιάν over their catch; sailors perform παιᾶνες by Phrynichus, Stesichorus, and Pindar at Athen. 250 B = *TrGF* i. 3 Phrynichus T11 = Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F 32. Performance of the παιάν on ship may be implied at Eur. *IT* 1403–4; *Tro.* 126; perhaps also *Hyps.* fr. 1. iii. 9 Bond; παιάν-singing on a ship also at Ach. Tat. 2. 32. 2.

⁴² Strabo 3. 4. 18.

What form the παιάν took in these contexts cannot be established with certainty from our sources. But I would suggest that although there are some differences from the pre-battle παιάν (sources for the victory παιάν rarely mention antiphonal performance; invocation of Enualios is not attested for victorious armies), it should probably be seen as a slightly modified re-enactment of the pre-battle παιάν.⁴³

A more formal celebration of a victory could have been held some time after the battle. Such a celebration could have coincided with an established religious festival, so that the victory was commemorated as part of the festival every year; alternatively, a new festival could have been created in honour of the victory.⁴⁴ Performance of παιᾶνες could have been an appropriate part of such secondary celebrations of victory, and the interval would have allowed the composition of more elaborate songs. Thus, Pindar, D2, seems simultaneously to celebrate the festival of Apollo Derenus at Abdera and to commemorate a victory won over some Thracians; perhaps commemoration of this victory was an established part of the festival. The παιάν addressed to the Spartan general Lysander could belong to a Samian festival commemorating his victories.⁴⁵ And the most plausible interpretation of a Spartan παιάν to the east wind (Euros), the end of which survives, is that it comes from a song celebrating a military victory in which the east wind was believed to have played a part; again, it could have been composed for a festival commemorating the victory rather than as a spontaneous celebration.⁴⁶

A postscript to the history of the victory παιάν is provided by Roman cult. The Roman *triumphus*, with its ritual cry *trumphe, triumphe, triumphe*, was believed in antiquity to be related to the Greek διθύραμβος (although Bacchus had no role in the *triumphus*, and although classical Greek sources show no clear link between

⁴³ For the link with the pre-battle παιάν see Deubner (1919), 388, criticizing Fairbanks's view ((1900), 62–3), that the victory παιάν is independent of the pre-battle παιάν and related to the cult παιάν. A rare reference to an antiphonal παιάν is *Vita Soph.* 3, cited in n. 40 above. Lonis (1979), 121 ff. suggests that the victory παιάν may have been dedicated to Dionysus.

⁴⁴ For an excellent discussion of festivals commemorating victories see Pritchett (1971–91), iii, 155 ff.

⁴⁵ See pp. 57–8.

⁴⁶ *PMG* 858 = *P. Argent.* W.G. 306v, col. ii, from a papyrus of an anthology from the 2nd cent. BC; see Snell (1937), 90 ff. A military function might be suggested by Paus. 8. 36. 2, according to which the citizens of Megalopolis in Arcadia maintained a cult to Boreas (invoking the wind as Σωτήρ!) in gratitude for help in a victory over the Spartans in 262 BC; see Hampe (1967), 12.

that genre and the celebration of victory). To commemorate lesser or bloodless victories the Romans used a lesser form of celebration, the *ovatio*, characterized by a different ritual cry: *ova, ova, ova*. Interestingly, Plutarch in one passage links the *ovatio* to performance of the *παῖάν*: *Marcellus*, 22. 3–4 οὖον ἐπιπαιανίσαι τὴν ἀπόλεμον ταύτην καὶ πανηγυρικὴν ἀπεδίδου πομπὴν ὁ νόμος ('the law allowed them this unwarlike and festal procession, like performing a paean after the event'). This is strange, since *ova* may represent the Bacchic cry *εὐοῖ* (although Plutarch gives it a different etymology). Plutarch was aware of a contrast between the wild, ecstatic *διθύραμβος* and the calm *παῖάν* (*De E ap. Delphos*, 389 A–B), and he has superimposed these two categories on the *triumphus* and the *ovatio*. The point of comparing the *ovatio* to ἐπιπαιανίσαι is not so much that the *παῖάν* is a song of victory (in that case it would go with the *triumphus*), but rather that the resolution of conflict celebrated by the *ovatio* is bloodless and peaceful.⁴⁷

(e) Other cultic scenarios

Just as the name 'Paian', which is usually used of Apollo, less commonly of Asclepius, can be applied to other deities as well, so *παῖάνες*, though normally addressed to Apollo and Asclepius, can also be dedicated to other deities. The similar distribution of the divine name and the *παῖάν*-songs is probably not a coincidence, since the use of the name 'Paian', usually in the refrain, was one of the defining features of the genre, and the one to which it owes its name.⁴⁸ Given the existence of this link, we can make two sorts of inference with a reasonable degree of probability: first, from the information that a *παῖάν* was sung in honour of a deity we can infer that the deity was addressed as 'Paian'. Thus, the performance of *παῖάνες* in honour of Athena can be deduced from the testimony of the novelist Heliodorus that ἑφήβοι sang *παῖάνες* during the Panathenaia, whence the inference can be drawn that she was addressed as 'Paian' (R114): we happen to have independent information that she was worshipped under the epithet *παῖωνία* in Oropus in Attica.⁴⁹ Secondly, if a deity was addressed as 'Paian', then it is reasonably likely that *παῖάνες* were sung in his/her honour. Thus, the evidence

⁴⁷ For the connection between *triumphus* and *διθύραμβος* see W. Ehlers, *RE*² xiii. 493. For Plutarch on the *παῖάν* and *διθύραμβος* see pp. 82–3.

⁴⁸ Käppel (1992b), 62 ff.

⁴⁹ *Aith.* 1. 10; for the reliability of Heliodorus see Pouilloux (1983); Mikalson (1976), 151. The epithet *παῖωνία* occurs at Paus. 1. 2. 5; 1. 34. 3 (Oropus).

in Hesychius that Zeus was worshipped in Rhodes under the name 'Paian'—Παιάν Ζεύς· τιμᾶται ἐν Ῥόδῳ, ἢ εἶδος ᾠδῆς ('Paian Zeus: he is worshipped in Rhodes, or a kind of song')—suggests that Zeus was honoured with παιᾶνες there.⁵⁰

Just as I suggested earlier that syncretism may have played a part in the early development of the παιάν, so these developments could be considered as reflecting further degrees of syncretism.

This broader use of the παιάν in cult reflects the very general use of the παιάν-cry in sacrifice and libation. Tragedy is an important source here, e.g. a passage of Aeschylus' *Septem*, where Eteocles asks the χορός of girls to utter a sacrificial cry in reply to his prayer (267 ff):

κἀμῶν ἀκούσας' εὐγμάτων, ἔπειτα σὺ
ὀλολυγμὸν ἱερὸν εὐμενῇ παιώνισον,
'Ἐλληνικὸν νόμισμα θυσιάδος βοῆς.

(Hearing my prayer, utter a paean, a holy, kindly cry of *ololuge*, the Greek convention for a sacrificial cry.)

The unique phraseology combines the female ὀλολυγή with the παιάν-cry which we usually associate with men.⁵¹ The context of sacrifice may also sometimes have accommodated the performance of παιάν-songs.⁵² This ritual function is suggested in an entry in Hesychius: τελεσίερον παιᾶνα· τὸν ἐπιτελεστικὸν τῶν τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιτελουμένων ἱερῶν ('a sacrifice-fulfilling παιάν/παιάν-cry: one that completes the sacrifices that are completed for the gods'). The unique epithet τελεσίερον indicates both the closural position of the παιάν/παιάν-cry with respect to the order of events of the sacrifice and also the manner in which the delivery of ritually correct utterance could be said to complete the ritual.⁵³

The engagement of the παιάν with the chthonic sphere is complex. Occasionally, chthonic deities and heroes are appealed to with

⁵⁰ See p. 131. Further sources for παιᾶνες sung in honour of deities other than Apollo and Asclepius are Polyb. 4. 20. 8; Plato, *Symp.* 177 A; Aristid. *Or.* 29. 4 (Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν κωμῳδεῖν), i. 752D; Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a21–5 (cited on p. 105).

⁵¹ Other tragic sources are Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 161 (*Niobe*) (pp. 49–50); *Cho.* 149–51 (p. 119).

⁵² As one can see, for example, from Σ at the end of D3.

⁵³ Hesych. iv. 139 Schmidt; with Waanders (1983), 155. This citation has sometimes been connected with D7. 2: see D7 n. 3. Perhaps the expression could also have had the sense 'Paian who puts an end to the sacrifice (i.e. destroys it) if he is not invoked in the right way'. Compare my discussion of paeanic ambiguity (§11, particularly (e), pp. 121–2).

παιᾶνες, e.g. the Corinthian hero Agemon according to Athenaeus (R113), and Hecate in the *Μολποί* inscription.⁵⁴ On the other hand, the παιάν is also felt to be incompatible with death: this is partly because Apollo had no part in the chthonic sphere; it is also because the παιάν can have joyful connotations, and these were felt to be incompatible with the world of death. Thus, in Polycrates' account of the Amyclaeon Huakinthia the joyful παιάν to Apollo is not sung during the initial phase of the festival while Hyacinthus is being mourned. Again in Plutarch's description of the burial of Aratus of Sicyon, although the παιάν is sung, it belongs to a late phase when the Sicyonians celebrate the news that Aratus is to be buried in Sicyon, whereas their immediate response to his death is the *θρήνος*.⁵⁵ In a Thasian inscription from the fifth century BC setting out the cultic honours due to the Nymphs and Apollo παιάν-singing is expressly forbidden, and this is usually and probably rightly taken to indicate that παιᾶνες were regarded as inappropriate in the worship of the chthonic Nymphs.⁵⁶ Aeschylus adapted this idea of the incompatibility of the παιάν and the chthonic sphere in a fragment of his *Niobe* (*TrGF* iii fr. 161) in which a character, probably trying to dissuade Niobe from excessive grief, says that Death cannot be supplicated by any means, even by addressing παιᾶνες to him:⁵⁷

μόνος θεῶν γὰρ θάνατος οὐ δώρων ἐρά
οὐδ' ἄν τι θύων οὐδ' ἐπισπένδων ἄνοις,
οὐδ' ἔστι βωμὸς οὐδὲ παιωνίζεται·
μόνου δὲ Πειθῶ δαιμόνων ἀποστατεῖ.

(Alone of the gods Death does not desire gifts, nor would you accomplish

⁵⁴ See Athen. 696 F (=Polemo fr. 76); also Polyb. 4. 20. 8; *Μολποί* inscription, 28 ff. The fundamental discussion of chthonic deities is Wide (1907).

⁵⁵ Apollo excluded from the chthonic sphere: e.g. Stes. *PMG* 232. Burial of Aratus: see p. 57.

⁵⁶ *IG* xii/8. 358(a) Νύμφησαν κάπολλωνι νυμφηγέτη θήλυ καὶ ἄρσ | -εν ἅμ βόλη προσ-
έρδεν· δὴν οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ χοῖρον. οὐ παιωνίζεται ('For the Nymphs and Apollo, the leader of the Nymphs, sacrifice a male or female victim, whichever you like; it is not ritually correct to sacrifice a sheep or a pig; the παιάν is not sung'); Ziehen (1906) no. 109, 290 ff., connects with the sacrifice without wreaths to the Kharites on Paros, mentioned in Apollod. *Bibl.* 3. 15. 7; see the discussions of Seyrig (1927), 180 ff.; Mellink (1943), 38 n. 4; Pouilloux (1953-8), i. 336-7.

⁵⁷ For the sense of παιωνίζεται see p. 22; the abnormality of singing παιᾶνες to Death is implied by Philostratus at *VA* 5. 4 (referring to the inhabitants of Gadeira) γήρως οὖν βωμόν ἱδρυται καὶ τὸν θάνατον μόνοι ἀνθρώπων παιωνίζονται ('They have established an altar to Old Age, and they are the only people in the world who sing παιᾶνες to Death').

anything by sacrificing or pouring libations. There is no altar and paeans are not addressed to him. Only from this god does Persuasion stand aloof.)

The same idea was also exploited by Sophocles in his *Polyxena* (*TrGF* iv, fr. 523), in which the ghost of Achilles described itself as having left the ἀκτὰς ἀπαίωνας of Acheron, where ἀπαίωνας probably means 'lacking παιᾶνες' (though one could also analyse the word ἀπαίωνας, which would mean 'lacking life').⁵⁸

(f) *The συμπόσιον*

Related to the use of the παιάν to accompany sacrifice and libation in cult are the παιᾶνες that accompanied the libations that were poured before the drinking started at the συμπόσιον.⁵⁹ We hear of three libations accompanied by παιᾶνες in this context, and this probably means that three drinking-bowls were filled in the course of the συμπόσιον, and that a libation was poured from each, accompanied by a παιάν, rather than that three libations were poured from each bowl, each accompanied by a παιάν. The three libations and accompanying παιᾶνες were made to different deities: the first to Olympian Zeus, the second to heroes or other chthonic deities, and the third to Zeus Soter.⁶⁰

Variations on this pattern are sometimes found. The dinner-party represented in pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica*, ends with a παιάν-prayer to Kronos, all his children, and the Muses (a range which still includes both Olympian and chthonic spheres) (1147 A). Athenaeus ends his dinner-party with a performance of Ariphron of Sicyon's παιάν to Health (*PMG* 813, R30). Pindar audaciously adapted the usual sequence in the proem of *Isthmian* 6 to suit a succession of three victories by Phylacides of Aegina: he imagines two libations as thank-offerings to Nemean Zeus and Poseidon for victories already

⁵⁸ For the history of these two interpretations see *TrGF* iv ad loc.

⁵⁹ Von Blumenthal (1943), 2348–9; Fabbro (1986). Three distinct παιᾶνες are implied at Pherecrates, *PCG* vii, fr. 138 (*Persai*), 5 ἔγχει κάπιβόα τρίτον παιῶν', ὃ νόμος ἐστίν ('pour in and shout in addition the third παιῶν which is customary').

⁶⁰ The three libations: *SPind. Isth. 6* (Dr iii, 251. 24); Aesch. *TrGF* iii, 55 (*Epigoni*); *Supp.* 24 ff. (with Whittle and Johansen's note); Soph. *TrGF* iv, fr. 425 (*Nauplius*); Plato, *Phileb.* 66 D with Σ; Sjövall (1931), 85 ff.; Kircher (1910), 17–21; Garvie (1970), 80. Literary aspects of the idea of three cries are brought out by Burian (1986). Libations were also offered to ἀγαθὸς δαίμων, apparently after the meal (Kircher (1910), 15, citing Ar. *Kn.* 85 ff.; *Wasps*, 525; Xenarchus, *PCG* viii, fr. 2), and to Hermes, apparently at the very end of the συμπόσιον (Kircher (1910), 19–21, citing Hom. *Od.* 7. 136 ff.; Ar. *Plut.* 1132; Strattis, *PCG* vii, fr. 23; Pollux, 6. 100); but we hear of no παιᾶνες accompanying these.

won at Nemea and at the Isthmos; and he anticipates offering a third libation to Olympian Zeus as a thank-offering for a victory in the Olympian games. Here, then, the libation to Olympian Zeus has been transferred from first place to third, where it has been combined with the libation to Zeus Soter; the libation to the heroes has been replaced with a libation to Poseidon.⁶¹

Sceptics have sometimes argued that the *παιάνες* sung at the *συμπόσιον* were not *παιάν*-songs but merely *παιάν*-cries or short prayers.⁶² Support for the hypothesis that they were songs is furnished by a tradition which goes back to Dicaearchus' *Περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων*, and is represented by Plut. *Sump. probl.* 615 B, to the effect that the *παιάν* was one of three types of song performed at the *συμπόσιον*.⁶³

πρῶτον μὲν ἦδον ὥδῃν τοῦ θεοῦ κοινῶς ἅπαντες μιᾷ φωνῇ παιανίζοντες, δεῦτερον δὲ ἐφεξῆς ἐκάστῳ μυρσίνης παραδιδομένης, ἣν αἶσακον οἶμαι διὰ τὸ ἄδδεν τὸν δεξιόμενον ἐκάλουν. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτῳ λύρας περιφερομένης ὁ μὲν πεπαιδευμένος ἐλάμβανε καὶ ἦδεν ἀρμυζόμενος, τῶν δὲ ἀμούσων οὐ προσιεμένων σκολιὸν ὠνομάσθη (τὸ μέλος διὰ) τὸ μὴ κοινὸν αὐτοῦ μηδὲ ῥάδιον.

(First, they sang an ode in honour of the god together, uttering the *paean* with a single voice. Secondly, [each participant sang] in turn, as to each was passed a myrtle-branch, which they called *aisakos*—I think because the one who received it sang. Finally, a lyre was passed around, and those skilled in its use would take it and accompany themselves in song, but the unmusical did not welcome it and the song was called *skolion* owing to its esoteric and difficult nature .)

The contrast between the three types of song seems to demand that *παιάν* was not a mere *παιάν*-cry but a more developed form of song, though simpler than some others. The considerable antiquity of the practice of performing a *παιάν*-song instead of or in addition to the *παιάν*-cry is indicated by a fragment of Alcman (R4):⁶⁴

θοίναϊς δὲ καὶ ἐν σιάσοισιν
ἀνδρείων παρὰ δαιτυμόνεσσι
πρέπει παιᾶνα κατάρχειν.

(In feasts and in men's dinner-parties among the diners it is fitting to begin the *paean*.)

⁶¹ See further p. 171.

⁶² Harvey (1955), 172, discussed on p. 8.

⁶³ Dicaearchus, fr. 88 (*Περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων*), 69 ff. Wehrli; Reitzenstein (1883), 5 n. 1, Severyns (1934).

⁶⁴ *PMG* 98 = 129 Calame; see von der Mühl (1951).

Probably the form of performance envisaged here is that of one performer (or diner) starting with a solo (κατάρχειν), and the rest of the company joining in.⁶⁵ I would suggest that the fragment is self-referential and from the beginning of a παιάν performed in the context of a συμπόσιον.

Apotropaic παιᾶνες or victory παιᾶνες sometimes seem to have intruded at συμπόσια. According to a passage of Xenophon's *Hellenica* (4. 7. 4), when an earthquake occurred during a συμπόσιον, Agesipolis and the Spartans sang the παιάν concerning Poseidon (R51):

δειπνοποιουμένου δ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἀργεΐᾳ τῇ πρώτῃ ἑσπέρα, καὶ σπονδῶν τῶν μετὰ δείπνον ἤδη γενομένων, ἔσεισεν ὁ θεός. καὶ οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀρξαμένων τῶν ἀπὸ δαμοσίας πάντες ὕμνησαν τὸν περὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶν παιάνα.

(While he was dining in Argos on the first evening and the libations had been performed after dinner, the god caused an earthquake. And the Spartans all sang the paeon concerning Poseidon, those in the public tent starting first.)

Elsewhere Xenophon says that while the Sicyonians were relaxing and preparing dinner, the Phliasians overcame them in a surprise attack, and then dined on the enemy's provisions, pouring libations and singing:⁶⁶

καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν ταῦτα δειπνήσαντες καὶ οἴκοθεν ἄλλα ἐλθόντα, ὥς ἐπ' εὐτυχίᾳ σπείσαντες καὶ παιανίσαντες καὶ φυλακὰς κατασκευασάμενοι, κατέδραβον.

(And they, dining on these and other things that they brought from home, poured libations and sang paeans to celebrate their good fortune and then, having posted guards, they went to sleep.)

Evidence of this sort suggests that the παιάν was a more flexible medium of expression than might be suggested by a systematic classification of its performance scenarios. The fact that given an appropriate occasion, an apotropaic παιάν to Poseidon or a victory παιάν could be substituted for a συμπόσιον-παιάν suggests that for the Greeks these were not fundamentally distinct types of songs, but closely related varieties of the same type of song.

⁶⁵ The verb κατάρχειν is found in a similar context at Philod. παιάν (CA 167), 62. On antiphonal performance in general see p. 66.

⁶⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 7. 2. 23. There is another example in Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 216 = Athen. 630 F.

(g) *The παιάν as ritually correct utterance (εὐφημία)*

Performance of παιᾶνες could mark occasions perceived as having special significance, including the beginnings and ends of undertakings. The link with beginnings is exemplified by the performance of παιᾶνες when ships set sail,⁶⁷ and it can be illustrated by several parodies of παιᾶνες in comedies by Aristophanes: in the *Wasps* (869 ff.) the χορός sings a παιάν at the point where Philocleon goes to law; in the *Thesmophoriazousai* (295 ff.), at the opening of the women's assembly a female herald utters a prayer (in prose) which concludes with the phrase ἰὴ παιάν, ἰὴ παιάν, ἰὴ παιάν, χαίρωμεν; if this is a faithful parody of a part of the ceremony associated with the Athenian ἐκκλησία, we can infer that it opened with a παιάν also.⁶⁸ In the *Knights* (1316 ff.) the singing of παιᾶνες in the theatre is one of a number of well-omened precautions that the Sausage-seller thinks appropriate before announcing that he has renewed Demos.

In these cases performance of the παιάν is linked with εὐφημία—ritually correct utterance, which often amounts to ritual silence, since the utterances regarded as ritually correct are very few. Thus, before the χορός sings their παιάν in the *Wasps* Bdelycleon asks for εὐφημία (868); in the *Thesmophoriazousai* the heraldess begins her prayer with a request for εὐφημία: 295–6 εὐφημία ἔστω, εὐφημία ἔστω 'let there be ritually correct utterance, let there be ritually correct utterance'; in the *Knights* εὐφημία is the first precaution the Sausage-seller asks for: 1316 εὐφημεῖν χρή καὶ στόμα κλείειν 'It is necessary to speak in a ritually correct manner and to close one's mouth'. It is clear from this and other evidence that the utterance

⁶⁷ *Suda*, iv. 73. 26 Adler παιανίσαι· τὸν Παῖα να ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, ἣν δὲ ἔθος καὶ ἐπὶ ἔργου ἀρχομένους . . . ('sing the παιάν: invoke Paian, and it was the custom also when beginning an action'). Fairbanks (1900), 18 ff. posited that the pre-battle παιάν was a form of the 'Paean before important undertakings', but the pre-battle παιάν is so specialized that it seems bad methodology to make it a subdivision of a general category. παιάν performance at the departure of ships: Thuc. 6. 32. 2 (p. 123) (performed by the crew? or people on the shore? or both?). This association is also attested by the very obscure *EM* 131. 37–9 (Färber (1936), ii. 30): ἀποστεπτικὸν ἄσμα οὕτω καλοῦμενον, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ ἀποστεφθῆναι τοὺς στεφάνους ἦδετο ἐν τοῖς παιᾶσι μελλόντων ἀποπλεῖν ('The garland-removing song is so called because after the garlands had been removed it was sung among the παιᾶνες [παιάν-cries?] by men about to sail'). Ships often sailed with garlands on: Wachsmuth (1967), 312 ff.; removing them is usually a response to death: Blech (1982), 366.

⁶⁸ For such parodies see W. Horn (1970); Kleinknecht (1937); Deubner (1919), 389.

of παιᾶνες or παιάν-cries was a widely used formula for generating ritually correct utterance.⁶⁹

The same category might accommodate παιᾶνες sung upon the onset of spring, or at daybreak. For the former category Delatte's discussion of Stesichorus, *PMG* 212 (R9), remains important. Spring παιᾶνες were often associated with Apollo, who was believed to return from the north at this time; we also hear that Pythagoras encouraged the singing of spring παιᾶνες, and that they were generally used in south Italy for the purpose of healing.⁷⁰ Just as they were sung at the beginning of the year, so they could be sung at the beginning of the day: Ion sings παιᾶνες at sunrise in Euripides' *Ion*; Porphyry attributes the same practice to Pythagoras (the tendency to identify Apollo with the sun may have been a factor here); and in a fable related by Aelian a cock joined in a παιάν to Asclepius that was being performed at dawn. A late inscription from Epidaurus seems to lay down that Ariphron's παιάν to Health should be performed during the first hour of the morning.⁷¹

Beside the link with beginnings, performance of παιᾶνες is also

⁶⁹ See also Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 350. 4; Eur. *IA* 1467 ff.; *IT* 1403-4; Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 35(b) 9-10; at Macedonicus, παιάν (*CA* 138), 2, the χορός are asked to sing εὐφήμῳ γλώσσει ('with a well-spoken tongue'; the verb εὐφημέιτε restored in *CA* has turned out to be wrong: see Pordomingo Pardo (1984), 110-11). More complex is Aesch. *Ag.* 1246-8 Κα. Ἀγαμέμνωνός σέ φημ' ἐπόψεσθαι μόρον | Χο. εὐφημον, ὦ τάλανα, κοίμησον στόμα. | Κα. ἀλλ' οὔτι παιών τῶδ' ἐπιστατεῖ λόγῳ (CASS. 'I say that you will see the death of Agamemnon.' CHO. 'Unhappy woman, lay to rest your mouth so that it is well-spoken.' CASS. 'But in no way does παιάν stand over this speech'). Denniston and Page (1957), 183-4, argue that on the one hand the obvious force of line 1248 is 'This is no occasion for παιάν' (in view of the association between εὐφημία and the παιάν-cry, although in line 1247 it is εὐφημία in the sense of ritual silence that is implied), but that on the other hand the interpretation 'No healing deity presides over this speech' is favoured by the detail of the sentence.

⁷⁰ Delatte (1938); cult παιᾶνες sung in the spring include Alc. 307cV; *Theognid.* 776 ff. The source for Pythagoras' spring παιάν is Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 25. 110; for healing παιᾶνες the source is Aristox. fr. 117 Wehrli (p. 38). The singing of παιᾶνες and the spring may also be associated in ps.-Plut. *De fluv.* 5. 2 (= Käppel (1992b), Test. 118) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ ῥάβδος ὀνομαζομένη λευκόφυλλος· εὐρίσκεται δὲ τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Ἑκάτης περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον πρὸς παιανισμὸν ἔνθεον αὐτοῦ περὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ἔαρος ('The reed called *leukophullos* grows on the river (Phasis). During the mysteries of Hecate at the start of spring it is sought out at dawn for the purpose of inducing a παιάν-cry under its influence'). One meaning of this obscure text might be that *leukophullos* was eaten to produce a state of ecstasy, in which initiates in the mysteries of Hecate uttered the παιάν-cry.

⁷¹ For Ion's παιάν see p. 112; for Pythagoras' see Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 32. 34. 6-13 Nauck; for Apollo and the sun see p. 198; for the dancing cock Aelian fr. 98 = *Suda* i. 385. 19 Adler. There is a παιάν-singing dog at Ael. *HA* 8. 2. The Epidaurian inscription is *IG* iv/1(2). 132-4; see p. 42.

associated with endings. The victory *παιάν* is the paradigmatic case of this pattern. The closural function of *παιάνες* I discuss later in connection with the refrain (§7b).

(h) *Celebration and wedding*

Uttering a *παιάν*-cry might also be a general expression of delight. At *Peace*, 555, Aristophanes represents instructions given to the Athenians when peace is restored: ἀλλὰ πᾶς χώρει πρὸς ἔργον εἰς ἄγρον παιωνίσας ('but everyone go to his job to the country, singing the paean'). Slightly earlier in the *Peace*, in the scene where the *χορός* pull the deity Peace from the cave (lines 453 ff.), the dialogue between Trygaeus and Hermes parodies the use of the *παιάν*-cry to express jubilation at a success.⁷² In the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* Socrates says that life is simply a stay abroad, and that after living it in a moderate manner men must leave it μόνον οὐχὶ παιωνίζοντας ('virtually rejoicing').⁷³

Παιάν-songs were not performed with the sole purpose of expressing joy, but some of the functions that we have distinguished were incidentally joyful, none more so than the victory *παιάν*. Performance of *παιάνες* could also celebrate a safe return (as dramatized in the final lines of Bacch. *Ode* 17: R26), recovery from illness (e.g. the *παιάνες* to Sarapis composed by Demetrius of Phaleron in gratitude for the recovery of his sight: R58),⁷⁴ or deliverance

⁷² The joke is this: Hermes shouts ἢ Παιών, ἢ; Trygaeus qualifies this with 'Take away the *παίειν*! just say ἢ.' Hermes agrees and says ἢ ἢ. Compare the later etymology of the word *παιάν* from *παίω* mentioned on p. 14.

⁷³ *Ax.* 365 B; according to the *Chaldaean Oracles* (fr. 131 des Places; the source is Damascius rather than Olympiodorus: see Westerink (1977), ii. 285, 371), the soul when released from the body ascended *παιάνα ᾄδων* ('singing the *παιάν*'); *παιάνες* in the context of the soul's liberation from the body are mentioned also by Maximus of Tyre, 9. 6 (107. 12 Hobein), as pointed out by Lewy (1977), 200 n. 102; a similar association in the anonymous *Chion of Herakleia*, 17. 2. Other instances of the celebratory *παιάν* include Dem. 18. 287 *κωμάζειν καὶ παιανίζειν* ('celebrate and sing the *παιάν*'); the expression 'laetum paeana' twice in Virgil: *Aen.* 6. 657; 10. 738; Ach. Tat. 7. 15. 3; D.H. *Ant.* 8. 55. 1. Hesych. iii. 253 Schmidt glosses *παιάνες* by *κώμους*. The Byzantine novelist Eustathius Macrembolites remembers the celebratory function: *Hysmine and Hysminias*, 10. 13; 10. 17; 11. 1.

⁷⁴ D.L. 5. 5. 76 (fr. 200 (=fr. 68) Wehrli). Demetrius may have had a role in setting up the cult: see Stambaugh (1972), 2 ff. Diogenes Laertius tells us that these *παιάνες* were still sung in his day (early 3rd cent. AD); for other Egyptian *παιανιστά*/honouring Sarapis see p. 61 n. 7. Another *παιάν* of thanksgiving is the short hexameter coda to Diophantos of Sphettos' lyric poem about his illness (R83).

from tyranny (e.g. by Jews upon the fall of the anti-Semitic Roman governor Flaccus in AD 38).⁷⁵

Another context of joyful παιάν-singing is the wedding. This is first attested at the end of Sappho's description of the marriage of Hector and Andromache (44. 31 ff.; R7):⁷⁶

πάντες δ' ἄνδρες ἐπήρατον ἱάχον ὄρθιον
 πάον' ὀνκαλέοντες ἐκάβολον εὐλύραν
 ὕμνην δ' Ἑκτορα κἀνδρομάχαν θεοεικέλο[ις]

(All the men sang the lovely high-pitched paean, invoking the far-shooter with the fair lyre, and sang Hector and Andromache, like to the gods.)

Similarly, Aeschylus described how Apollo sang a παιάν at the marriage of Peleus and Thetis; Aristophanes' *Birds* ends with a celebratory παιάν which invites interpretation as a wedding παιάν.⁷⁷ The expression γαμήλιος παιών occurs in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousai*, in a passage which seems to be a parody of Euripides' *Andromeda* in which the heroine was represented as complaining:

γαμηλίῳ μὲν οὐ σὺν
 παιῶνι, δεσμίῳ δέ,
 γοᾶσθέ με.

(Not with a marriage paean but with one of binding mourn me.)

Andromeda thinks of her being bound to the rock as a substitute for marriage, and suggests that instead of a marriage παιάν the χορός sing a 'παιάν of bondage', an allusion to the concept of a 'binding spell' (κατάδεσμος; ὕμνος δέσμιος at Aesch. *Eum.* 306, 331–2, 344–5), a charm with the purpose of incapacitating an intended victim. The verb γοᾶσθε ('mourn') suggests the analogy between marriage and death, a well-established conceit in Greek tragedy. Finally, the passage also reflects the idea that a παιάν can be both a positive song of jubilation (here a παιάν of marriage) and also a negative song, like an apotropaic παιάν (the παιάν of bondage) (see §11).⁷⁸

We have no evidence that wedding παιᾶνες were composed by classical lyric poets. Pindar's *Paianes* seem to have contained an account of the wedding of Niobe (F9), which might be considered

⁷⁵ Philo, *Flac.* 121.

⁷⁶ πάον' in line 33 is ambiguous: it could mean either the deity or the song. On the marriage παιάν in general see von Blumenthal (1943), 2349–50.

⁷⁷ Ar. *Birds*, 1763–5; cf. Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 350.

⁷⁸ Ar. *Thesm.* 1034 ff. (=Eur. *TGF* fr. 122). For the binding spell see most recently Faraone (1985). The ὕμνος δέσμιος in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* is discussed in Faraone (1991).

a theme with a special appropriateness to a song of this genre in view of the association between *παιᾶνες* and weddings (though a reference to the wedding of Niobe might have been ill-omened in a *παιάν* composed for a real wedding).

(i) *Commemorating the dead*

Παιᾶνες seem also to have been sung in honour of dead men, probably with the implication of heroization. An early example is the *παιᾶνες* sung at the Gumnopaidia in honour of the war dead of the battle of Thyrea. This practice seems to become much more common in the Hellenistic period. An interesting case is the heroization of Aratus of Sicyon (231 BC) described by Plutarch: when Aratus was killed the Sicyonians mourned, but dirge-singing turned to *παιάν*-singing when news arrived of an oracle declaring that he was to be buried in Sicyon. Here the *παιᾶνες* do double work: their primary function is that of hymns in honour of Aratus, but they also express the joyful mood of the people, contrasting with their earlier grief, when they hear that he is to be buried in Sicyon (so too *παιᾶνες* supersede grief in the context of cult in the Amyclaeon Huakinthia). The *παιάν* sung by the Chalcidians in honour of the Roman general Titus Flamininus after his death in 174 BC is another example (R68).⁷⁹

(j) *Praising the living*

In the early Hellenistic period *παιᾶνες* were not only used to commemorate potentates after their deaths but were also addressed to living rulers, again presumably with the implication of heroization or apotheosis; a number of these are mentioned by Athenaeus in his discussion of Aristotle's Hermias-song.⁸⁰ It has sometimes been thought that there is a precedent in the classical period for the prac-

⁷⁹ Gumnopaidia: p. 31. Burial of Aratus: Plut. *Arat.* 53. 3. Titus Flamininus: Plut. *Flam.* 16. 4; *CA* 173.

⁸⁰ There are good surveys in Habicht (1970), 148; Cameron (1995), 292–5. The Athenians sang *παιᾶνες* to Antigonos Monophthalmus and Demetrius Poliorcetes and his entourage after the liberation from Demetrius of Phaleron in 306 BC (Athen. 252 F–253 D = Demochares of Athens, *FGrH* 75 F 1–2); the poet was Hermocles of Cyzicus, selected after a competition (Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 165); the Rhodians sang a *παιάν* to the deified Ptolemy Soter (Gorgon of Rhodes, *FGrH* 515 F 19), presumably after the failure of the siege of Rhodes in 304 BC; Alexinus of Elis composed a *παιάν* to Craterus of Macedon (Hermippus, fr. 48 Wehrli); a fragment of a *παιάν* to Seleukos survives from Erythrae (*CA* 140; dated to 283–282 BC by Grainger (1990), 185). A few decades later Aratus of Sicyon was alleged to have sung *παιᾶνες* in honour of Antigonos Doson (Plut. *Cleom.* 16. 6). Finally, the philosopher

tice of singing *παιᾶνες* in honour of living potentates in the *παιάν* which Duris of Samos reported was sung in honour of the Spartan general Lysander (*PMG* 867; R35), and which began:⁸¹

τὸν Ἑλλάδος ἀγαθέας
στραταγὸν ἀπ' εὐρυχόρου Σπάρτας
ὑμνήσομεν, ὦ ἰὲ παιάν.

ὦ ἰὲ Page: ὦιη MSS

(We will sing the general of holy Greece from Sparta with its wide dancing-places. O *ie paian!*)

However, the phraseology of the sources does not prove that the *παιάν* was composed during the lifetime of Lysander, and it seems likely that it was composed only after his death in 395 BC, in view of the absence of any other evidence for the payment of heroic or divine honours to a living commander before Alexander (the Samian *Lusandreia* need not predate his death either).⁸²

6. PERFORMANCE

(a) *Performers*

As the foregoing analysis makes clear, *παιᾶνες* were usually performed by groups of men (just as the *παιάν*-cry was predominantly a male utterance). Sometimes these were *χοροί* who performed for the purpose of entertaining or honouring the gods. At other times they were soldiers, for whom entertainment was not the primary purpose. Alternatively, they could be guests at the *συμπόσιον* who sang together but did not dance. Or they could be groups of men hastily assembled for some purpose who put on an *ad hoc* performance not amounting to much more than a repeated *παιάν*-cry.

As well as by adult males, *παιᾶνες* were performed by adolescent males (*ἐφηβοί*, also *νέοι*) or even male children (*παῖδες*). Several extant *παιᾶνες* include invocations to young men, presumably as performers, and we should perhaps think of these as designed for

Epicurus addressed Mithres, minister of Lysimachus, and the hetaira Leontion, as 'Paian' according to D.L. 10. 5.

⁸¹ Reported by Duris ap. Athen. 696 E (*FGrH* 76 F 26; cf. F71) and Plut. *Lys.* 18. Also Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 34. 4; *Marc.* 8. 2.

⁸² Habicht (1970), 5, 244, believes that the *Lusandreia* and the *παιάν* both date from 403 BC; so Shipley (1987), 133–4. This view is disputed by Badian (1981), 33–8. If after all the *παιάν* does date from the lifetime of Lysander, its primary purpose might have been not to praise the commander but to celebrate the victory.

organizations of ἔφηβοι or νέοι. The same link is corroborated by an Attic Khoes-vase of about 420 BC which represents four young men returning from the Khoes festival with the names Kallos, Neanias, Komos, and Paian. It may be that this association was rationalized by a folk-etymology which saw the word παιάν as containing the vocative παῖ. Thus, there is a resemblance between the singers and the deity invoked, who is generally represented as being a young male, a model for ἔφηβοι of what they are and for παῖδες of what they will one day become. The limiting case is when the deity is represented as singing the παιάν himself, as if a mirror image of the performers.¹

Male performers are thus the norm. There are rare cases in which performers are represented as female: the παιάν was supposedly invented by Nymphs encouraging Apollo to shoot the Delphic dragon; the Deliades performed the παιάν, according to Euripides; in Greek tragedy a χορός of women can be represented as singing παιᾶνες, as for example in the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. But it seems likely that all of these would have been perceived as inversions of the normal convention.²

It is also rare for a παιάν to be performed by a soloist without any contribution by a χορός. An isolated instance would be the kitharodic παιᾶνες that Strabo associates with the ancient contest at Delphi. Ion sings a solo παιάν in Euripides' *Ion*, but this may be another case where tragedy transgresses convention. Apollo can be represented as singing solo παιᾶνες, as can Pan, but these are also special cases.³

In one case the singers are represented as a group of priests. These are the Cretan παιήνες of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. It is uncertain whether groups of priests ever performed παιᾶνες in real life. Certainly, it is much more common for the performers to be, not priests or people with a special sacred function, but citizens. This is true whether one thinks of performances at festivals, such as the

¹ Young men: Erythraean παιᾶνες to Apollo (*CA* 140), 10, and to Asclepius (*CA* 136), 2 (= 137. 1), and Macedonicus' παιάν, 4; Pind. D6. 122 (the address to the νέοι: see p. 315). Attic vase: *ARV*² 1318. 1 in *LIMC* s.v. *Paian*. Link with παῖς: see on D9. Resemblance between deity and worshippers: see the image of the young Paion in Callistratus, *Eikon* 10. Deity singing: Philodamos of Scarpheia's *Paian to Dionysus*, 62 ff.

² The Nymphs: see p. 25. The Deliades: p. 29. The χορός in the *IA*: p. 111.

³ Kitharodic παιᾶνες: Strabo 9. 3. 10; p. 27. On κιθαριῶδοί see H. Abert, *RE* s.v. xxi. 530–4; Herington (1985), appendix III, pp. 177 ff.; West (1971). Pan: Dr i. 2. 2 ff. Apollo: Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 350; Eur. *Ion*, 906.

παιάν performances at the major Spartan festivals of Apollo, or of performances by soldiers before and after battle, or of performances at the *συμπόσιον*.

Somewhere between the 'priest performer' and the 'citizen performer' can be placed performers who, though normal citizens, hold a special office or belong to a special group which marks them out as singers. The best-attested group of παιάν-singers are the Milesian *Μολποί*, information for whom comes from an important inscription of the fifth century BC which preserves some regulations from the previous century. The *Μολποί* were religious officials who may once have enjoyed a measure of political power but whose duties were probably purely ceremonial by the period from which our records date. The antiquity of the guild is indicated by the occurrence of similar ones in the Milesian colonies of Olbia on the Black Sea and on Amorgos, both founded in the seventh century BC. The inscription gives instructions for παιάν performances which they are required to give at stations along the sacred route from Miletus to Didyma.⁴

There were many other sacred guilds associated with cults of Apollo, and these may be suspected of performing παιάνες even if they are not attested as having done so. One thinks of the Athenian *Πυθαϊσταί* and *Δηλιασταί*. Another instance would be the *Ὀρχησταί*, prominent Athenians who danced around the temple of Delian Apollo at the Thargelia and held *συμπόσια* (Euripides was supposed to have poured wine for them). It seems likely that the performance of παιάνες formed part of their ritual either at the Thargelia or at the *συμπόσια* or on both occasions.⁵

In Sparta we have late testimony for παιάν-singers called *παιανίαι*, and although we know nothing at all about their function, it seems likely that this group was similar to the *Μολποί*.⁶ The same cannot be said for the groups of *παιανισταί*, attested in the second and third centuries AD in Athens in the context of the cult of Asclepius there, in Peiraeus, in Eleusis, and, in the context of the cult of Sarapis

⁴ The *Μολποί* inscription: *LSAM*, no. 50; Wilamowitz (1904); Poland (1935), 509–10; Kawerau and Rehm (1914), no. 133; Graf (1979); (1974); Robertson (1987); Ehrhardt (1983), 142 ff. Luria (1927). Political structure: Robertson (1987), 359; Graf (1979); Ehrhardt (1983), 202. Olbia: Graf (1979). Aegiale: *JG* xii/7. 418. Sagalassus: MacCridy (1905), 167. Perhaps also in Sinope: see Ehrhardt (1983), 136.

⁵ Theophrastus, fr. 119=Athen. 424 E–F.

⁶ Repertory, R86–96; Poland (1909), 399; *παιανίαι* in Hesych. iii. 253 Schmidt, though the text is problematic (the second half of the entry seems to be misplaced).

and of the Roman Emperor, in Egypt and Rome. These probably consisted of professional performers, like the *τεχνῖται Διόνυσου*, and so should be distinguished from whatever groups of *παιάν*-singers existed in the classical period.⁷

In the classical period, by contrast, the groups who staged *παιάν* performances consisted of non-professional citizens. Sometimes they held special offices, like the *Μολποί* or the *Ὁρχησταί*, but often they had no such distinction. It seems likely that such groups, and their performances, generally had a political significance. The cult of Apollo played a special part in the life of the polis; Fritz Graf has shed light on the important role played in Ionian cities (including Athens) by the cult of Apollo Delphinios. His temple, the Delphinion, was the centre for activities that defined male identity, particularly the transition from adolescence to manhood and incorporation into the citizen body. At Miletus the Delphinion served as a headquarters for the *παιάν*-singing *Μολποί*, and it is easy to think of their *παιάν* performances as themselves an expression of the social practices and values that the institution stood for.⁸ Although by the fifth century BC the political significance of the *Μολποί* and analogous groups in other poleis was on the wane, in earlier centuries it may have been of great importance.

What social or political functions might performances of *παιάνες* by such male groups have had? Probably three. First, in so far as the members of such groups represented the male citizenry of the

⁷ Athens: *IG* ii/2. 2481, restored by Oliver (1940) (late 2nd cent. AD), and the list on the left-hand side of the Sarapion monument (p. 145). Piraeus: *οἱ παιανισταὶ τοῦ Μουνιχίου Ἀσκληπιοῦ* ('*παιάν*-singers of Asclepius at Mounikhia'): *SIG* 1110 = *IG* ii/2. 2963 (see Oliver (1940), 311). Here their chief is called a *λογιστής*: see Poland (1909), 379. Eleusis: *SEG* xxxii. 232. Egypt: *SGUA* i. 5803 (Karnak) τὸ προ(σ)κύνημα | τῶν παηανιστῶ(ν) τοῦ μεγάλου Σεράπισ καὶ θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς(ς) εἰς Διοσπόλεις πάσας ('adoration of the *παιανισταί* of great Sarapis and the divine Augustus in the presence of the gods in the whole of Thebes'); *SGUA* iii. 7090 = i. 1743 (Panopolis): *Διδύμη* . . . εἰς Πανῶν Σαραπίωνι παηανιστῇ ('Didyme . . . for the *παιανιστής* Sarapion to Panopolis'); Oliver (1949), 313. Demetrius of Phaleron is supposed to have written *παῖνες* to thank Sarapis for restoring his sight (see p. 55); *POxy* 675 = *PMG* 1035 may preserve part of such an Alexandrian *παιάν*. *POxy* 3018 contains part of two documents laying out privileges of Egyptian *παιανισταί*, one dating from the time of Severus and Caracalla, the second from the time of Hadrian. Rome: *IG* xiv. 1084 (Oliver (1940), 312), in honour of Sarapis, probably a group of citizens imported from Alexandria (Vidman (1969), no. 384). The term used for the group is ἡ ἱερὰ τάξις τῶν Παιανιστῶν ('the sacred order of the *Παιανισταί*'), on which see Poland (1909), 169; also *IG* xiv. 1059. Oliver believes that the Roman *παιανισταί* are derived from the Egyptian; so R. E. A. Palmer (1993).

⁸ For Apollo and the Delphinion see Graf (1979); Sourvinou-Inwood (1990), 309.

polis, they will have had the integrative function of articulating a sense of community among the members, and of expressing this sense before the polis as a whole. Second, such performances were a useful training for hoplite warfare (itself a performance scenario for the παιάν, as we have seen). Third, in so far as the members of such groups were the guardians of citizenship, and presided over the initiation of adolescent males as new citizens, such performances will have had the function of transmitting its values from one generation to another. Thus, there turns out to be a connection between the performance of the παιάν and the mechanism of initiation. This can be compared to Calame's argument that song-dance performed in religious contexts by χοροί of adolescent girls functioned as a mechanism of initiation whereby girls were prepared for adult life, and that both dance and song conveyed coded moral messages about the standards of behaviour expected of them.⁹

Sometimes παιάν-singing was part of a broader initiatory framework in which a group of young men took part in an expedition to a sanctuary. This could be a local sanctuary such as Asine for Argos (one thinks of Bacch. fr. 4), the sanctuary of Apollo Derenos for Abdera (Pindar, D2) or Didyma for Miletus (did ἔφηβοι accompany the Μολποί?). This is the sort of 'bipolar' relationship between polis and local sanctuary to which De Polignac has attributed central importance in the development of the polis from the eighth century BC. Alternatively, it could be a pilgrimage (θεωρία) to a more distant national sanctuary, usually a sanctuary of Apollo. Such expeditions or pilgrimages by young men can be interpreted as spatial encoding of the idea of transition from one age-group to another via separation from the community. (Exactly the opposite movement serves the same purpose in the Delphic Septerion, in which the departure of a παῖς from the polis, his purification in the distant territory of Tempe, and his subsequent return symbolized the collective initiation of young men into the adult community.)¹⁰

The chief value believed to be transmitted by such training would have been a habituation to orderliness. One dimension of this is the discipline of the performance itself; another aspect is the music, which seems to have been felt as possessing an orderly component;

⁹ See Calame (1977a), *passim*.

¹⁰ De Polignac (1984); θεωρία I hope to discuss in a separate study. The Delphic Septerion: see pp. 201–3. Evidence for initiation rituals in the cult of Apollo on Delos: Calame (1977a), i. 195 ff.

and finally on the levels of explicit or implicit *παραίνεσις* some fragments of classical *παιᾶνες* seem to advocate a general moral code of moderation and decorum.¹¹

The idea of *παιάν* performance as having a social function seems to be reflected in a passage of Plato's *Laos* (664 c), which recommends a model for the use of *χοροί* in the ideal state. The male population is to be organized into three *χοροί*: one for boys, dedicated to the Muses, a second for men under 30, dedicated to Paian/Apollo, and the third for men over 30 and below 50–60, dedicated to Dionysus. (The three *χοροί* are perhaps modelled on the three *χοροί* who performed at the Spartan Gumnopaidia.) The second *χορός* are naturally to be thought of as singing *παιᾶνες*, which is in line with the association between *παιᾶνες* and adult male singers that we have observed elsewhere. The content of the songs sung by all the *χοροί* is moral and political truths, specifically the doctrine that the most just life is also the most pleasant. The men in the second *χορός* are imagined as appealing to Paian (probably in the form of a *παιάν*-refrain) to help them in their task:

... τόν τε Παιᾶνα ἐπικαλούμενος μάρτυρα τῶν λεγομένων ἀληθείας πέρι καὶ τοῖς νέοις ἵλεων μετὰ πειθοῦς γίγνεσθαι ἐπευχόμενος.

(... calling on Paian as a witness of the truth of what is said, and praying that he show favour to the young men and bring persuasion with him.)

Their appeal to Paian seems to have two functions: the first is to provide confirmation of what has been said (as if the god were a witness in a lawsuit); the second is to direct a prayer to the god to persuade the young men (as if persuasion is a form of healing). In both cases the function of *παιάν*-singing is didactic—for the performers, for the polis as a whole, but particularly for the younger men.

(b) Modes of performance

We have seen that performance of *παιᾶνες* was generally a group activity. The most common mode of performance was procession. A clear illustration of this is provided by the inscription of the Milesian *Μολποί* (lines 28 ff.), which describes their procession to Didyma. *παιᾶνες* are to be sung in honour of Hecate in front of the gate (i.e. of Miletus), then by Dynamis (paralleled in Teos), then on a height by the Nymphs, then by Hermes at a place called Kelados,

¹¹ Examples collected on pp. 166 ff.

then by Phulios (a hero?), by Keraiites (a place?), and by Chares (another hero?). Nothing is said about performance of παιᾶνες at Didyma itself, but this is perhaps assumed.¹²

There are many other examples of παιάν-singing χοροί taking part in processions. Thus, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* relates how Apollo led the Cretan pirates in a processional παιάν to Delphi; in several of the Pindaric *Paianes* there are clear references to movement on the part of the χορός. Performance of παιᾶνες seems to have been a feature of the Athenian procession to Eleusis.¹³

Theoric χοροί probably performed in procession as they approached the shrine. One thinks of the χορός that Nicias arranged to perform at Delos in the 420s, which (at least according to Plutarch's account) walked from Rheneia to Delos across a bridge of ships.¹⁴ Performances by theoric χοροί may have taken place at other points on the route to the sanctuary also: we know that the θεωροί from Naxos in Sicily offered sacrifices on setting out, and it is possible that a χορός accompanying such a θεωρία would have performed its παιάν on departure also.¹⁵ Theoric χοροί travelling by land might have performed also at ritually significant points *en route*.¹⁶

Songs performed in this way might have been called προσόδια also. Consider Ar. *Birds*, 857 ff.:

ὁμοροθῶ, συνθέλω,
 συμπαρανέσας ἔχω
 προσόδια μεγάλα σεμνὰ προσιέναι θεοῖς
 καὶ προβάτιόν τι θύειν.
 ἴτω, ἴτω, ἴτω δὲ Πυθιάς βοά,
 συναυλείτω δὲ Χαίρις ᾠδᾶ.

(I applaud, I am willing, I agree and have great and holy procession-songs to approach the gods and a sheep to sacrifice. *Ito, ito*, let the Pythian shout go forth! Let Chaeris play an accompaniment to the song on the *aulos*.)

¹² The route of the *Μολποί* is examined in detail by Gödecken (1986); cf. the passage cited on p. 22. For Dynamis in Teos see *ML* 30 (Teian *Dirae*), 32; for Keraiites see Call. fr. 217 (= *EM* 504. 9; *EGud* (Sturz) 315. 30).

¹³ *HH Apollo*: see p. 24. Pindaric *Paianes*: §20. Athenian procession to Eleusis: *IG* ii. 1078. 29–30 (= Fairbanks (1900), 117).

¹⁴ *Plut. Nic.* 3. 4. ¹⁵ *θεωροί* sacrificed at the altar of Apollo Archagetas outside the city of Naxos: *Thuc.* 6. 3. 1; also p. 292. For Naxos and pilgrimage see Rutherford (1998a).

¹⁶ e.g. Call. fr. 87 = Steph. Byz. s.v. *Δειπνιάς*, 223. 12 Meineke; Paus. 1. 37. 6 ff. mentions sacrifices on the route from Delphi to Athens at τὸ ποικίλον ὄρος ('the spotted mountain'); Boethius (1918), 50; Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 75 (apropos of the θεωρία sent from the Attic Tetrapolis to Delos: daily sacrifices are made in the Pythion at Oenoe while it is away).

The *χορός* explicitly describes the songs they are going to sing as *προσόδια* (this is the earliest occurrence of the word), but the expression *Πυθιάς βοά*, which must be the *παῖαν*-cry, suggests that the songs were *παῖνες*.¹⁷

Another common mode of performance is circular motion. In the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* a *χορός* performing an antiphonal *παῖαν* seem to be imagined as moving round an altar, accompanying sacrifice. In an Erythraean inscription instructions are given to perform the *παῖαν* to Apollo three times around the altar of the god. The Athenian *Ὀρχησταί*, mentioned in §6a, are said by Theophrastus (fr. 119) to have been in the habit of dancing round the temple of Delian Apollo.¹⁸

It goes without saying that dance was part of a normal performance of a *παῖαν*; we have already seen many examples of it. This would be true of all lyric genres, but perhaps particularly of the *παῖαν*, whose patron Apollo was especially associated with dancing and is addressed as 'dancer' in a beautiful line by Pindar (fr. 148) (=H4). Similarly, Aelius Aristides describes an epiphany in which Pan appeared to Pindar 'dancing' one of his *Paianes* (although other sources describe Pan's performance differently).¹⁹ Dance is attested in many performance scenarios, but the celebration of victory is a performance scenario that particularly welcomed it.²⁰ Of the types of dance involved, and their movements, we know almost nothing (alas), except that one characteristic was a stamping motion of the

¹⁷ For the general association between the two genres see also e.g. Athen. 253 B *παῖνας καὶ προσόδια ᾄδοντας* ('singing *παῖνες* and *προσόδια*'). Cases of overlapping between categories are discussed further in §9 and on pp. 323–4, 329–38 (apropos of D6).

¹⁸ Circular dance: Eur. *IA* 1467–84, on which see further p. 111; Erythraean inscription, A 34 ff.: see Graf (1985), 235; also *Theognid.* 776–9 *ἵνα τοι λαοὶ εὐφροσύνη | ἤρος ἐπερχομένου κλειτὰς πέμψωσ' ἑκατόμβας, | τερπόμενοι κιθάρῃ τ' ἥδ' ἐρατῇ θαλῇ | παῖανων τε χοροῖς λαχῆσί τε σὸν περὶ βωμόν* ('so that the people send famous hecatombs at the onset of spring in festivity, enjoying the *κιθάρα* and the pleasant feast, dancing of paeans and shouts of them around your altar'); Anton. Lib. 1. 1; Hesych. s.v. *γυμνοπαῖδια*, i. 394 Latte; Call. *Hymn* 4. 321–4 (=Bruneau (1970), 32 ff.); Himer. *Or.* 12. 6, 48. 10 (both times referring to Delphi).

¹⁹ Aristid. *Or.* 42 (*Lalia in Asclepium*), 12. He sings a *παῖαν* according to *Vita Ambr.* Dr i. 2. 2 and Eustath. *Prooem.* 27. He dances a song of no specific genre: Philostr. *Im.* 2. 12. 2; Liban. *Or.* 64. 13; etc. He sang a song about Pelops: Dr i. 5. 10; perhaps also *SAristid. Or.* 3 (*ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων*), 191 (iii. 564. 6 Dindorf); cf. the discussions of Lehnuš (1980), 65; Haldane (1968), 28–9. The tradition that Pan appeared singing a *παῖαν* may perhaps reflect an earlier identity between Pan and *Paian*: §2 n. 8.

²⁰ Dance in victory: Xen. *Ana.* 6. 1. 11; Tim. *Per.* 196 ff.

feet, denoted by the verb ῥήσσω at *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 516, and apparently not incompatible with marching.²¹

In view of the association with groups, one would assume that παιᾶνες were generally sung by a χορός in unison.²² Thus, performance of παιᾶνες would have been different from that of ἐπινίκια, which may (as has recently been suggested) have been performed by a single singer accompanied by a κῶμος.²³ Some evidence seems to point to a special form of choral performance for παιᾶνες, in which a large part of the song was sung by a single member of the χορός while the other members sang the refrain, or other parts of it, and perhaps danced.²⁴ The soloist's part of the performance may be what is referred to by the verb ἐξάρχω, first in Archilochus, *IEG* 121 (R5):²⁵ αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον παίηονα ('myself leading off the Lesbian paeon on the aulos'). The communal answer is denoted by συνεπηχέω in Xenophon's description of battle παιᾶνες, more generally, perhaps by verbs of speaking or singing beginning with the prefix ἐπ-.²⁶ This form of performance might be what is implied by the expression [ῥμ]νον ἐγερσιβόαν in the second line of Sophocles' παιάν; this epithet would be applicable to the παιάν in the sense that performance of a παιάν occasions the shout of a παιάν-cry.²⁷ Further evidence is provided by a passage

²¹ Also attested at D6. 17-18; Ael. fr. 98 (= *Suda*, i. 385. 19 Adler) describes how a cock joins in a paeanic song-dance, raising each leg in turn in a sort of ἀσκλησιασμός; Xen. *Ann.* 6. 1. 11. This form of dance is treated in its context by Lawler (1964), 100-1.

²² Singing in unison can be illustrated by Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 35(b), 9-10 ἰέμενοι ἐνοπῶν ἀγανοῖσιν [|] εὐφαιμον ἀπὸ φρενὸς ὁμορρόθ[ου]: ('casting a well-spoken cry with gentle . . . from a heart in unison').

²³ For recent views on how ἐπινίκια were performed see Lefkowitz (1988); Heath (1988); Heath and Lefkowitz (1991); *contra* Burnett (1989); Carey (1989); K. A. Morgan (1993); D'Alessio (1994a).

²⁴ This possibility is sketched by Davies (1988a), appendix 1, 'The Spirit of Compromise'. In this context I refer the reader to the word ἐπ[]κωμιο[in Z30 below, which could be from a *Paian*.

²⁵ Plut. *Lyc.* 22. 3; Xen. *Cyr.* 3. 3. 58. At Xen. *Cyr.* 4. 1. 6 παιᾶνα ἐξάρχεσθε ('you begin the paeon') seems to refer to the group. See also Philo, *Flac.* 121; *Suda* s.v. ἐξάρχοντες (ii. 303. 1 Adler); see §11 n. 19.

²⁶ συνεπηχέω at *Cyr.* 3. 3. 58; 7. 1. 25; for verbs of speaking or singing prefixed by ἐπ- see p. 71. This pattern is not confined to παιᾶνες; we also find it in the context of the dirge, e.g. ἐπιστενάχω in Hom. *Il.* 4. 154; 19. 301. The use of antiphonal refrains in lament is discussed by Alexiou (1974). In Bion's *Lament for Adonis* the main utterance is denoted by the verb αἰάζω and the antiphonal response with ἐπαἰάζω (on the refrain in this song see Estevez (1981)). See further §7b.

²⁷ Discussed on pp. 18-19; for βοά of a παιάν-cry see Aesch. *Sept.* 270; Πυθιάς βοά ('Pythian shout') at Ar. *Birds*, 858.

in which Aeschines deals with an accusation that he sang *παιάνες* in the company of Philip (*Fals. leg.* 162–3):

συνῆδον γὰρ τοὺς παιᾶνας Φιλίππῳ, κατεσκαμμένων τῶν ἐν Φωκεύσι πόλεων, ὥς φησιν ὁ κατηγορὸς. καὶ ποίῳ δύναται ἂν τις τεκμηρίῳ τοῦτο σαφῶς ἐπιδείξαι; ἐκλήθην μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰ ξένια μετὰ τῶν συμπρέσβων, ἦσαν δ' οἱ κλητοὶ καὶ συνδειπνοῦντες σὺν ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρεσβείαις οὐκ ἐλάττους ἢ διακόσιοι. ἐν δὲ τούτοις ὡς εἰκεν ἐγὼ διαφανῆς ἦν οὐχ ὑποσιγῶν, ἀλλὰ συνάδων, ὥς φησι Δημοσθένης, οὐτ' αὐτὸς παρών, οὔτε τῶν ἐκεῖ παρόντων οὐδένα παρασχόμενος μάρτυρα. καὶ τῷ δηλὸς ἦν, εἰ μὴ γε ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς προῆδον; οὐκοῦν εἰ μὲν εἰσίων, ψευδῇ μου κατηγορεῖς; εἰ δὲ ὀρθῆς ἡμῖν τῆς πατρίδος οὐσης, καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν κοινῇ μηδὲν ἀτυχούντων, συνῆδον μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πρέσβων τὸν παιᾶνα ἡνίκα ὁ θεὸς μὲν ἐτιμάτο, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ μηδὲν ἡδόξουν, εὐσέβουν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἡδίκουν, καὶ δικαίως ἂν σφωζοίμην.

(So I joined Philip in singing paeans when the cities of Phocis had been razed, as the accuser says. What evidence could be sufficient to prove that charge? I was invited with my fellow envoys to receive symbols of friendship, and those who were invited and were present at the banquet, including the ambassadors from the other Hellenic states, were not less than two hundred. And so it seems that among all these I was conspicuous, not by my silence, but by joining in the singing—so says Demosthenes, who was not there himself, and presents no witness from among those that were. Who would have noticed me, unless I had sung an introduction as they do in choruses? So if on the one hand I was silent, your accusations against me are false. If, on the other hand, while our native land was on its feet and our citizens had suffered no common harm, I sang the paean with the other ambassadors, when the god was being honoured, without any loss of dignity to the Athenians, I was acting piously and not doing wrong, and the just thing would be for me to be acquitted.)

What did the delegates sing? Merely *ἡ παιάν*? or a short *παιάν*-song known to all of them? At any rate, this is in contrast with the practice ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς, where a soloist begins and the *χοροί* sing something else in reply (whether they sing a single *παιάν*-cry or a more sustained response is unclear, but either way Aeschines still envisages a mode of performance incorporating both solo and choral parts).

This interpretation fits the evidence for the speaking subjects in Pindar, D2 and D4, which refer explicitly to a member of a local community (such explicit identification with a local community is never found in the *Epinikia*). There has been a tendency to take these as instances of a choral 'I', and something peculiar to *Paianes*. However, one could equally take it as a solo 'I', to be identified

with a hypothetical χορηγός drawn from the local community. One exception to this pattern seems to be D6, where (at least on the conventional interpretation) the speaking subject is the poet.²⁸

7. FORMAL FEATURES

We are less well informed about formal features than about functions, because information about function can be gleaned from secondary sources, which are relatively plentiful, whereas to establish formal features we need the actual texts of the songs, comparatively few of which survive. A second problem is that almost all of the παιᾶνες that survive are cult songs in honour of Apollo and associated deities, so that it is only for this function that we have information about the form. Given the sparseness of the evidence, we cannot be sure that the forms of apotropaic παιᾶνες or victory παιᾶνες were not fundamentally different.

(a) *Invocation of Paiawon/Paian*

The παιάν owes its name to its origin as an address to Paiawon/Paian, or some deity capable of being addressed by that name (§2). Most παιᾶνες contain some occurrence of the name, and invocation of Paiawon/Paian can thus be seen as the essential sign of the genre.

It is another question whether any song or poem or even utterance addressed to this deity would have been perceived as a παιάν. The question arises because some invocations of Paiawon/Paian occur also in songs and poems that are not normally regarded as παιᾶνες. I am thinking both of cases where the deity named as 'Paian' is one to whom that name would not usually apply, and also of cases of poems in non-lyric metres, such as hexameters or elegiacs. Unfortunately, there is no clear way of resolving this issue; the most convenient solution is to regard them as 'generic transgressions'.¹

The usual position for invocations of Paiawon/Paian is in the refrain, which normally comes at the end of the stanza or triad. More rarely, Paiawon/Paian is named at the start of the song, as in

²⁸ The standard view: Lefkowitz (1963). The only exception is *Pyth.* 5. 76, where the speaking subject seems after all to be a member of a χορός of Cyreneans; so most recently Krummen (1990), 139 ff., who excuses the apparent exception on the grounds that *Pyth.* 5 is at least in part a παιάν composed for the Cyrenean Karneia. For the speaking subject in D6 see pp. 308–9, 335 ff. For the speaking subject in Greek lyric see D'Alessio (1994a); Nagy (1990), 366 ff, 370 ff.

¹ Generic transgressions are discussed in §12; the relationship between generic identity and address to Paian is upheld by Käppel (1992b), 62 ff.

the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius, or in Macedonicus' *παιάν*. None of the extant Pindaric *Paianes* starts in this way, though the refrain comes at the start in D5.

The importance attached to the name *Paiawon/Paian* is indicated by the fact that its aetiology occasionally constitutes the theme of a song. Such aetiologies are found in, for example, Philodamus' *παιάν* to Dionysus, which seems to justify Dionysus' appropriation of the epithet 'Paian', and also in Limenios' *παιάν*, where the Athenians are presented as inventors of the epithet.²

(b) *The refrain: A typology*

A formal feature that has a claim to being distinctive of the *παιάν* is a special sort of refrain similar in appearance to the *παιάν*-cry, and implying an appeal to a deity under the name 'Paiawon/Paian'. It is not a consistent feature of the genre, but it seems to occur in about half the instances. In the case of *παιάνες* that lack a refrain, a similar function may have been served by the utterances of *παιάν*-cries in the course of, or after, the song.³

Παιάν-refrains generally contain an introductory *ἰή* (sometimes *ἰέ*, *ἰώ*, or even *ἰθι*);⁴ some have the element *παιάν* (*παιών*), but some lack it; some constitute a whole sentence, some only an exclamation.⁵ I would distinguish three types.

1. *With παιάν/παιών (Παιάν/Παιών) and not constituting a whole sentence:*

ἰή ἰή ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν D4, end of triad

ἰή Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν | δαίμονα κλεινότατον, | ἰὲ Παιάν Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius⁶

ἰή Παιάν Macedonicus' *παιάν*

² See pp. 34–5.

³ Refrain in Greek literature: Schwarz (1897); Moritz (1979); Cannatà Fera (1990), 124 ff. Link between refrain and *παιάν*: Athenaeus' discussion of Aristotle's song for Hermias and POxy 2368 (=SH 293), discussed on pp. 92–7. Extra-textual *παιάν*-cries: p. 21.

⁴ *ἰθι*: see Soph. *Phil.* 832; Philod. *παιάν* refrain; cf. *ἴτω ἴτω χορός* in *SLG* 460(b) (see Rutherford (1995c)). The *etymon* was sometimes thought to be *ἰημι*, hence *ἰή* with rough breathing: see p. 25.

⁵ Heph. *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, 7. 3 (71. 16 Consbruch), distinguished refrains that were significant (*ἐπιφθεγματικά*) from ones which were not (*ἐφύμνια*). The transmitted text gives it the other way round, but Westphal (cited in Consbruch's apparatus) must be right to reverse it.

⁶ This is a special case, since the first time it occurs *Ἀσκληπιὸν | δαίμονα κλεινότατον* completes the syntax of the preceding verb, but the second and third times it stands alone, governed by the preceding interjection. Only the first, Erythraean, version of

ἰὴ Παιών, ὦ, ἰὴ Παιών, ἰὴ Παιών, ὦ, ἰὴ Παιών, ἰὴ Παιών, ὦ, ἰὴ Παιών Erythraean παιάν to Apollo

ἰὴ ἱὲ Παιάν alternating with ὦ ἱὲ Παιάν Aristonoos, παιάν

ἱὲ Παιάν, ἱὲ Παιάν Isyllus' παιάν

ἰὴ ἰὼ ἱὲ Παιάν Cyrenaean παιάν = SEC no. 80 (R69)

ἱεῶ, ἐπι Παιάν (?) in *Hymnos* 10, PGM ii. 244 (R110)

2. With παιάν (παιών) and constituting a whole sentence:

ἰὴ ἱὲ Παιάν, ἰὴ ἱέ: Παιάν δὲ μήποτε λείποι D2, end of triad

ἱὲ Παιάν, ἔθι σωτήρ, | εὐφρων τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ' | εὐαίωνι σὺν ὄλβῳ Philodamus, παιάν

ὦ Παιάν ὦ Παιάν, | εὐαίων εὐαίων | εἴης, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ Eur. *Ion*, 125–7 = 141–3

3. Refrains that lack the element Παιάν/Παιών/παιάν (these never constitute a whole sentence):

ἰὴ ἰή D1

ἰήιε Δάλι' Ἀπολλόν D5, start of stanza; Soph. *OT* 154 is almost identical⁷

ἰή POxy 2368, Cassandra song

Cf. ἰὴ ἱὲ βασιλείαν Ὀλυμπίων νύμφαν ἀριστόποσιν S2

I use the term 'quasi-refrain' for a refrain-like expression that does not occur regularly in the song, e.g. D6. 121–2; Παιάν ἱὲ Παιάν in Limenios' παιάν, 13 ff. There are a number of quasi-refrains in the choral odes of tragedy. The first song in *PSI* x. 1181 (= Bacchylides, fr. 60. 37, R27) ends with a short quasi-refrain ἰὴ ἰή (the song might, but need not, be a παιάν). Related to quasi-παιάν refrains are the invocations of Pan at the end of the *Epidaurian Hymn to Pan* (ὦ ἰὴ Πὰν Πάν), and in Soph. *Ajax*, 694 ἰὼ ἰὼ Πὰν Πάν. From

the song preserves the original syntax; in the Macedonian and Alexandrian versions the words in the second and third instances of the refrain are in the form: Ἀσκληπιέ, δαῖμον κλεινότατε. The Erythraean version is clearly to be preferred on this point, being the *lectio difficilior*.

⁷ IHIE is ambiguous: it can either be an interjection, i.e. ἰὴ ἱέ (as in D2. 35, 71, qq.v.), or the vocative of ἰήϊος, an adjective derived from the interjection and meaning 'invoked by cries', unambiguously (i.e. in cases other than the vocative) at Aesch. *Ag.* 146; Euphorion fr. 85. 2 van Groningen; Ar. *Lys.* 1281–2; of Asclepius in *IG* ii/2. 4533. 6 (=R103); Tim. *Per.* 198. Ambiguous cases, besides D5, are Soph. *OT* 1096, Ar. *Wasps*, 874; Tim. *Per.* 205; *PMG* 858 (=the Spartan παῖάν to Eurys); Call. fr. 18. 6 ἰήϊε (the rough breathing perhaps reflects the Pythoetonia aetiology, explicit at *Hymn* 2. 118; cf. p. 25); A.R. 2. 712 (rough breathing restored). Radt (1958), 44, asserts that the adjective never occurs in 'kultische' παῖάνες (a category which for him covers Pindar's *Paianes*), but it seems to occur in D9. 3. ἰήϊος is also an epithet for words denoting 'pain' at Soph. *OT* 174; Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 1, iii (p. 27 Bond), 9; *El.* 1210; similarly ἰήϊον at Eur. *Pho.* 1036–7.

the chronological point of view, the use of the quasi-refrain should probably be seen as a later development, the repeated refrain being the more basic form.⁸

Refrains generally come at the end of formal units (triads or strophes) within the song; cases where they come at the start of a formal unit or in the middle (*μεσύνιον*) are comparatively rare.⁹ This final position is reflected in the ancient terminology for the refrain: the most common terms are *ἐπίφθεγμα* and *ἐφύμνιον*, in which *ἐπι-* has the force of 'after'.¹⁰ Some refrains are formally more or less independent of the preceding part of the song (such as the refrain at the end of the first triad of D₄), others are bound to it in some way and integrated into the whole (such as the refrain in D₂, which in each of its three occurrences is placed at the climax of the preceding section of the verse). This feature may reflect the development of the refrain from a communal *παῖάν*-cry following a ritual event or speech as an endorsement (rather like 'Amen'). This seems supported by the fact that in descriptions of *παῖάν*-cries their utterance tends to be expressed with verbs bearing the prefix *ἐπι-*, which implies that the utterance follows something else as an endorsement.¹¹

Within the song the *παῖάν*-refrain seems to have two main formal functions. First, it marks closure. I would draw particular attention to Bacchylides, fr. 60. 37; the quasi-refrain at the end of the second triad of D₆; the reference to the *παῖάν* at the end of Bacchylides,

⁸ Quasi-refrains in tragedy: Soph. *OT* 154, 1096. *PSI* x. 1181 is conventionally ascribed to Bacchylides, but I am impressed with the thesis of Davison (1934), that it should be connected with Sim. *PMG* 571. The fact that the title of the next song is a mythological description—ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠΙΔΕΣ—suggests that both songs were classed as *Dithuramboi*. The association between the *παῖάν* and Pan is discussed in §2 n. 8.

⁹ At the start of a formal unit in Pind. D₅, and in the Erythraean *παῖάν* to Apollo; in the middle in Philod. *παῖάν*; also perhaps in Aristonoos' *παῖάν*.

¹⁰ *ἐπίφθεγμα* in Athenaeus, also *ἐπιφθεγματικόν* in Heph. *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, 7. 3 (71. 16 Consbruch); *ἐφύμνιον* at Heph. *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, 7. 1 (70. 14 Consbruch). One can compare rhetorical terms describing types of final statement, such as *ἐπιφώνημα* (e.g. Hermog. *Inu.* 4. 9), *ἐπίκρισις* (e.g. Hermog. *Id.* 1. 6; 1. 11; 2. 7; 2. 8).

¹¹ Some examples: *ἐπευφημέω* Eur. *IT* 1403; Aesch. fr. 350. 4 Radt; *ἐπαύτῃ* Call. *Hymn* 2. 102; *ἐπικελεύω* Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 31 = Strabo 9. 3. 12; *(συν)επηχέω* Xen. *Cyr.* 3. 3. 58, 7. 1. 25; *ἐφρυμένω* Aesch. *Per.* 392; *(συν)επεύχομαι* Thuc. 6. 32; Bacch. fr. 60. 36; *ἐπιβοάω* Pherecrates, *PCG* 7 fr. 138 (*Persai*), 5; *ἐπεξιακχάζω* Aesch. *Sept.* 635; *ἐπιμέλω* Aesch. *Sept.* 869–70; *ἐπόρνυμι* Pind. G₆. 4; *ἐπαιέω* Ael. Arist. *Hymn to Heracles* (40), 21; with *συνεπαιέετε* at Eur. *IA* 1492; *ἐπιπαιανίζω* Diod. 5. 29. 4; Plut. *Marc.* 22. 3 (see p. 47); with *ἐπιπαιανισμός* at Strabo 9. 3. 10; *ἐπιφήμισμα* Thuc. 7. 75. 7; *(συν)επιφθέγγομαι* (the *etymon* of *ἐπίφθεγμα*) at Pind. G₁. 19; Plut. *Sumpr. probl.* 713 A; Call. *Hymn* 6. 1, 118.

Ode 17; Sappho, fr. 44; perhaps in Simonides, *PMG* 519, fr. 35(b), 9–10.¹² Second, the complement of the function of marking closure is to mark transition, e.g. from the narrative ('Y') to the conclusion ('Z').¹³ A quasi-refrain marks a transition at D6. 121–2, where (as often) it is followed by asyndeton, and a reference to a παῖάν-cry has a similar function at lines 196 ff. of Timotheus' *Persae*. There may be another instance of a transitional refrain at Simonides, *PMG* 519, fr. 55. The clausula Πύθιε Παῖάν seems to mark off sections in a hexameter παῖάν to Apollo and Daphne transmitted in a Greek magical papyrus.¹⁴

(c) *Other forms of generic signature*

A σφραγίς or seal is a formula that identifies the author of a poem.¹⁵ Invocations of Paiawon/Paian and παῖάν-refrains can be thought of as σφραγιῖδες which point towards a generic identity. I suggest we call them 'generic signatures'. In the classical period, when differences between genres are still mainly a function of differences of performance scenario, such generic signatures reflect the generic identity. In the post-classical period, when formal features are much more important as criteria of genres, generic signatures may come to be the primary bearers of generic identity.

Invocations and refrains may not be the only form of generic signature found in παῖάνες. The same function may sometimes be served by references to the παῖάν and/or to παῖάν performance. There is a good example in the opening of Pindar, D2, where the χορός de-

¹² On the last see Rutherford (1990), 171 ff. Another poem which may end with a reference to παῖάν-singing is Prop. 3. 15 (see G. Gould's Loeb text; Rutherford and Naiden (1996)); and notice also the παῖάν-singing that concludes the narrative in Tim. *Per.* 196 ff. The third of Isidorus' hexameter *Hymnoi* to Isis ends with an appeal to Paian (lines 35–6): see Vanderlip (1972), 50; Totti (1985), 81. An imitation in modern English poetry is S. T. Coleridge's poem 'The Visit of the Gods'. The clausal παῖάν is also encountered in prose works, as in Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 22 (277. 15 ff. Hobein), and *VH* 1. The clausal properties of the refrain seem to have been noticed by Wilamowitz (1922), 445, who says 'Der Refrain ist der Ahnherr der Klausel'. Rarely, an appeal to Paian comes first, as in Plato, *Crit.* 108 c; Ov. *AA* 2, which begins with a triumphant παῖάν-cry; Plut. *Sump. probl.* 743 c, which can be considered an instance of the performance of παῖάνες at the beginning of an undertaking (§58).

¹³ The symbols X, Y, Z I adapt from Hamilton (1974).

¹⁴ Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 55: see Rutherford (1990), 177 ff. In the παῖάν to Apollo and Daphne = R112 Πύθιε Παῖάν concludes the proem and marks the transition to the praise of Apollo (line 1), concludes the praise of Apollo, and marks the transition to Daphne (line 18), and concludes the whole composition (line 21).

¹⁵ For the σφραγίς see Kranz (1961); Cerri (1991).

scribe themselves as 'pursuing a *παιάν*' from the shrine of Abderus to that of Apollo Derenus and Aphrodite. This complex description alerts the reader at the outset to the genre of the song, as well as its mode of performance and locale. In Limenios' *παιάν* the generic signature is the description of how Apollo was hailed as 'Paian' when he came through Attica (an aetiology of the name, in fact).

The preceding cases are comparatively simple, because we know that the songs involved were *παιᾶνες*. Other songs contain passages which resemble paeanic generic signatures, but it is difficult to be sure because the very genre of the songs is in question. For example, the opening of G9 seems to have referred to the *παιάν* of Xenocritus of Locri: is this reference a way of signalling that the present song is also a *παιάν*? Another case is Bacchylides, *Ode* 17, which ends with the ascent of Theseus from his submarine adventure and the responses of the young men and women who wait in his ship, framed by a closing prayer:

- 125 . . . ἀγλαόθρονοί τε κούραι σὺν εὐθυμῖα νεοκτίτῳ
ὠλόλυνξαν, ἔκλαγεν δὲ πόντος· ἤϊθ' εἰ δ' ἐγγύθεν
νέοι παιάνιξαν ἔρατ' ὀπί.
130 Δάλιε, χοροῖσι Κηϊῶν φρένα ἱανθεῖς
ᾧπαζε θεόπομπον ἐσθλῶν τύχων. |||

(. . . the young women, wearing festive flowers, shouted the *ololuge* with fresh courage, and the sea resounded. And the young men nearby sang the *παιάν* with lovely voice. Delian one, warmed in your heart by the *χοροί* of Ceians, grant a heaven-sent attainment of good things.)

The final prayer is a *σφραγίς* which identifies the performers (Ceians) and probably the place of performance (Delos). That makes one think of a *παιάν*, and perhaps the *παιάν-ὠλόλυγή* sung by the young men and women in the myth is part of the *σφραγίς* as well, and is meant to identify the song as a *παιάν*. The Hellenistic editors of Bacchylides thought differently and classed the song as a *Dithurambos*, but the last word should not always be theirs.¹⁶

(d) Structure and themes

Among the cult *παιᾶνες* we find a wide variety of structures. Some have a single large stanza, such as Ariphron's *παιάν* to Health and Isyllus' *παιάν* to Asclepius (*CA* 134). Others have a small stanza with a regular refrain, and sometimes a *μεσόμενιον*, such as the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius (*CA* 136) and Pindar, D5. Still others

¹⁶ See p. 98.

have large triads, either with or without regular refrain: most of the Pindaric *Paianes* fall into this category; in some of them the triad is bigger than the usual size of the triad in the *Epinikia*; the *παιάν* of Limenios also seems to belong here. One would expect the earlier form to have had smaller stanzas, solo stanza alternating with antiphonal refrains, and the form with the larger stanzas to be a later development.¹⁷

Most of the cult *παιᾶνες* have the same internal divisions as other types of religious lyric: an opening (the 'X' section), a narrative (the 'Y' section), and a closing prayer (the 'Z' section).¹⁸ The openings generally introduce the deity: sometimes he is directly appealed to, occasionally in such a way that the 'X' section contains a prayer for an epiphany; in other cases the singer refers to the deity in the third person, calling on the Muses or on the *χορός* to sing the god.¹⁹ The formula 'I begin to sing' can be used in openings, and need not be analysed as a borrowing from the *Homeric Hymns*.²⁰ Some of Pindar's openings are variations on these types: he can address either the cult place itself (D6. 1) or the prophets associated with Delphi (B2. 1).

The inclusion of a narrative is a peculiar feature of the Greek hymnic tradition; if one compares Near Eastern or Egyptian hymns,

¹⁷ Large stanzas: p. 167. Development: contrast Käppel's thesis, discussed at §12 n. 6, that the complex refrain, with the addition of *μεσέμνια*, is a post-classical development.

¹⁸ Rainer (1975), 215 ff.; Keyssner (1932), 3, referring to Adami (1901); Buchholz (1912); Knoke (1924), 30. Contrast Adami's more complex division into invocation, parentage, *sedes*, epiphany, prayer. The point that all lyric genres share the same major structural features is made by Calame (1974), 123.

¹⁹ Direct appeal: C2. 1; Erythraean *παιάν* to Apollo, 11; Aristonoos, *παιάν*. Prayer for epiphany: Philod. *παιάν*, 1–5; perhaps Pind. D3. 10 ff.; Soph. *Phil.* 827 ff. Indirect appeal, calling on the Muses: Athenaios, *παιάν*, 1–3; Limenios' *παιάν*, 1–6; or calling on the *χορός*: Isyllus, *παιάν*, 1–2; Macedonicus, *παιάν*, 1–4. On the 'Du'-Stil vs. the 'Er'-Stil see Meyer (1933), 4, 63, drawing on Norden (1913), 143 ff.

²⁰ D2. 1–4; C2. 1 ff.; Soph. *παιάν*, 1–2. Contrast Radt (1958), 26, who argues that in both D2. 1–4 and *Nem.* 1. 1 ff. an invocation, which is the stuff of cult hymn, is followed by the introductory formula of an epic hymn (for the terms see Meyer (1933), 6 ff., 20). But the occurrence of the same pattern in Soph. *παιάν*, 1–2 (which Radt omits), makes it more likely that the formula (1) extended invocation + (2) *σέθεν ἄρξομαι κτλ.* was common in lyric poetry. Another lyric instance of an introductory formula is PMG 851(b) 4–5 (song of *φαλλοφόροι* to Bacchus) *ἀκήρατον | κατάρχομεν τὸν ὕμνον* ('we initiate a virgin song'). So few fragments of lyric hymns survive that we cannot be certain that it was not precisely from lyric hymns that the *Homeric Hymns* borrowed these functions. On formulae involving the idea of beginning in general see Danielewicz (1980), 41 ff.; Race (1982), 5 ff.

the absence of mythological narratives is striking.²¹ In surviving *παιᾶνες* the narratives almost always amount to aretalogy of Apollo or another deity or to an aetiology of a divine cult. Common themes for the narrative section are: (1) the birth of a deity; (2) the deity's visiting-places; (3) the establishment of a cult; (4) the great achievements of the god; (5) the progeny of the god; (6) the career of a hero, when this has some connection with the establishment of a cult.²² What we do not find are stories about the careers of heroes when this has no aretalogical or aetiological dimension. Oblique light on the typical content of *παιᾶνες* may be shed by Bacchylides, *Ode* 16, a *διθύραμβος*, which tells the 'tragedy' of Heracles and Deianeira, introduced with a proem which explicitly contrasts the subject-matter with the *παιᾶνες* that welcomed back Apollo to Delphi. Bacchylides seems to be telling us that a 'tragic' love story like this, without a strong religious dimension, is not appropriate subject-matter for a *παιάν*.²³

I devote more space to themes that occur in the *παιάν* (religious ideas, prophecy) in my discussion of Pindar's articulation of the genre in §19.

The final section is usually a closing prayer.²⁴ Common types are: (1) a prayer to a deity to send prosperity; (2) a prayer to a deity to manifest himself; (3) an exhortation to members of the *χορός* to receive the deity; (4) a prayer to a deity to receive the chorus or their song.²⁵ Like his beginnings, Pindar's endings are sometimes more complex (e.g. the ending of B1).

²¹ Egyptian hymns are collected in Assmann (1975); see also Zabkar (1988); for a good example of a Mesopotamian hymn see the so-called *Exaltation of Inanna*, ed. Hallo and van Dijk (1968).

²² For (1): Pind. C2; G1; Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 32; Isyllus, *παιάν*, 41–57. For (2): the *παιᾶνες* of Limenios, 11–17; of Philod. 14–62; of Aristonoos, 17–40. For (3): Philod. *παιάν*, 105–43; Bacch. fr. 4; Pind. D6. 62 ff.; also G8; B2; H1. For (4): killing the Delphic dragon (Athenaios, *παιάν*, 18 ff.; Limenios, *παιάν*, 21–7); or driving off the Gauls (Athenaios, *παιάν*, 21 ff.; Limenios, *παιάν*, 31–5). In Ariphron's *παιάν* the Y section is an explanation of the value of Health (there is no Z section). For (5): Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius, 10 ff.; Pind. A1. 41 ff. For (6): Neoptolemus in D6 etc. The importance of aetiology was first pointed out by D. Schmidt (1990).

²³ Bacch. 16 is discussed on p. 88.

²⁴ See Ael. Arist. *Or.* 14, i. 369D (*Ῥώμης Ἐγκώμιον*), 228 *κράτιστον οὖν, ὥσπερ οἱ τῶν διθύραμβων τε καὶ τῶν παιάνων ποιηταί, εὐχὴν τινα προσθέντα οὕτω κατακλείσαι τὸν λόγον* ('It is best to close the speech by adding a prayer, just like composers of *διθύραμβοι* and *παιᾶνες*').

²⁵ For (1): *παιᾶνες* of Isyllus, 59–61; of Macedonicus, 25–32; of Aristonoos, 41–8; Pind. D1. 9–10; in Limenios' *παιάν*, 36–49, the closing prayer is distinguished by metre from the preceding sections; Bacch. 17. 130–2. For (2): Erythraean *παιάν* to

(e) *Style*

It is hard to come to conclusions about paeanic style when so few *παιᾶνες* survive, and, more important, when even less survives of related types of song, so that it is not possible for us to distinguish features that are specifically paeanic from those that belong to religious lyric in general. For example, it can be observed that the epithets applied to deities in cult *παιᾶνες* are often fairly colourless, relating to the fame of the deity;²⁶ but this could be a general feature of cult hymns. The two things that strike one most about the style of surviving *παιᾶνες* are that its syntax is simple, and that there is a strong sacral flavour: in the latter respect developed *παιᾶνες* may be thought of as sustaining the same *εὐφημία*—ritually correct utterance—that we have seen was regarded as an effect of the *παιάν*-cry in certain circumstances. Examples of ‘ritually correct’ vocabulary in this sense might be *χαίρω* (*χάρμα*),²⁷ which can express the joy of the worshipper in the presence of the deity; also words meaning ‘bright’ such as *ἀγλαός*;²⁸ and words with a general positive sense such as *εὐαίων* (which happens to rhyme with the Attic *παιών*).²⁹

(f) *Metre*

παιών is a metrical term with two senses. The simple term, first certainly in Aristotle, denotes a foot composed of any combination of a long and three shorts (—υυυ, υ—υυ, υυ υ, υυυ—), closely related to the other five *-mora* feet: the cretic (—υ—) and the baccheius (υ—). When qualified by the epithet *ἐπίβατος* (and sometimes without it), it denoted a succession of five long syllables, divided in the ratio two

Asclepius, 19–20. For (3): Philod. *παιάν*, 144–56. For (4): Pind. D5. 43–8; probably D6. 181–3.

²⁶ *κλυτόμητις* in the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius (CA 136), 1; *κλεινότατον* *ibid.* 8; *ἀγακλυτῶ* *ibid.* 14; *περιώνυμε* in Soph. *παιάν*, 1; *εὐκλέα* in Philod. *παιάν*, 61.

²⁷ Ar. *Thesm.* 311; Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius, 3, 19, 22; Isyllus, *παιάν*, 58; the use of words of the *χάρις* family in lyric poetry is discussed by Race (1982), 5 ff.

²⁸ *ἀγλαο-*: the simple adjective at G1. 15; *ἀγλαιών*: D3. 5; *ἀγλαό[θρονος]*: D3. 1; *ἀγλαῶπις*: Soph. *OT* 215; *ἀγλαοχαίτης*: E1. 2; *ἀγλαῖζω*: Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 120(b), 6; *αἴγλα* occurs at Soph. *Phil.* 831 (*παιάν* to Sleep); at Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius, 13, as the name of a daughter of Asclepius; at Isyllus, *παιάν*, 46, as the mother of Asclepius and the *etymon* of his name. See Haldane (1963); A. C. Pearson (1911). According to Hesychius, *ἀγλαοπής* (i. 24 Latte) and *ἀγλαήρ* (i. 62 Latte) were epithets of Asclepius.

²⁹ e.g. the refrain to Philodamus’ *παιάν*, 13; Soph. *Phil.* 828 ff.; contrast *ἀπαιών* (*ἀπ-αίων* rather than *ἀ-παίων*?) in Soph. *TrGF* iv. 523 (*Polyxena*); also repeated in the refrain in Eur. *Ion*, 126, 142.

to three; this sense is mostly confined to late sources, but also occurs in a metrical treatise which might be by Aristoxenus (how unstable metrical terminology was is illustrated by the same source's use of the term 'cretic' for $\sim\cup\sim\cup$, what we would call a trochaic metron). The common factor is the possession of five units, divided into a ratio of 2:3 (the *ῥυμῶλιον*, as the ancients called this ratio).³⁰ The number five enters the lore of Apollo independently because one interpretation of the Delphic symbol *E* adduced by Plutarch is that it represented 'five', which was a number with great cosmological and mystical significance; this tradition and the metrical one could be connected, if they both had Pythagorean input.³¹

Given that the metrical term looks as if it might reflect the name of the genre, we might expect *παιᾶνες* to show signs of five-*moira* cretic-paeonic-bacchiac metre. The connection with 'cretic' metre seems to support this in view of the early association between Crete and the *παιάν*. Independent evidence associates cretic metre with the *ὑπόρχημα*, which is widely held to have been closely linked to the *παιάν*.³²

However, if we look around for *παιᾶνες* in cretic-paeonic-bacchiac metre, the evidence is disappointing. The best comes from the Hellenistic period, when Limenios and Athenaios chose stichic cretic for their Delphic *παιᾶνες*. There is a reason for thinking that this might continue a Delphic tradition, since a cretic line cited by Hephaestion is said by Choeroboscus to derive *ἐκ τῶν καλουμένων Δελφικῶν* ('from the so-called Delphic songs'); however, its content—an invitation to Dionysus to come to an altar—prima facie points to a *διθύραμβος* rather than a *παιάν*.³³ Equally problematic are two non-consecutive cretic-paeonic lines invoking Apollo cited by Aristotle in his discussion of paeonic rhythm in prose, which look as if they might come from some lost classical

³⁰ Simple term: first attested in Arist. *Rhet.* 1409³. *παιών ἐπιβατος*: ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1143 B; Arist. Quint. *De mus.* 1. 16 (37. 10 W-1). Aristoxenus (?): *POxy* 2687, ed. L. Pearson (1990), 79. The ratio of 3:2 (*ῥυμῶλιον*) as musically exciting: Arist. Quint. *De mus.* 2. 15 (82. 30 ff. W-1).

³¹ Plut. *De E ap. Delph.* 389 C–391 E.

³² *κρητικός* in a metrical context first at Cratinus, *PCG* iv. 242 fr. 237 (*Trophonius*), and *PMG* 967 (popular lyric). See also Harvey (1955), 173 n. 2. On cretic-paeonic metre: Koster (1953), 257 ff.; Korzeniewski (1968), 11–12, 191; West (1982), 106–7, 145–6; Wilamowitz (1922), 62 n. 3. Still useful is Giesemann (1892). The link between cretic metre and *ὑπόρχημα* is discussed on p. 100 n. 26.

³³ *PMG* 1031 = Heph. *Enklh.* 13. 4 (42. 7 Consbruch); Choeroboscus ad loc., 249. 2 Consbruch.

παῖάν or παῖάνες, though again other genres are possible.³⁴ And then there is Bacchylides, *Ode* 17, which may be a παῖάν, even though it was classified as a *Dithurambos* by Hellenistic editors, and which is composed in a paeonic-like syncopated iambic.³⁵ We also have some evidence about the metrical practice of the celebrated archaic paeonist Thaletas of Gortyn: Glaukos of Rhegium, cited in ps.-Plut. *De Musica*, 10, said that Thaletas imitated Archilochus, lengthening his μέλη (= κῶλα) and introducing cretic and paeonic, which he borrowed from the *aulos*-music of Olympus of Lydia. Perhaps Glaukos was arguing against an earlier view that Thaletas brought his technique with him from Crete. Unfortunately, we cannot take this testimony as certain proof that Glaukos believed that the παῖάνες of Thaletas contained cretic-paeonic metre, because the reference might equally well have been to the ὑπορχήματα that Thaletas is supposed to have composed for the Spartans.³⁶

If we consider the metre of extant παῖάνες by poets of the fifth century BC, the level of cretic-paeonic-bacchiac metrical coloration is not high, certainly no higher than that found in *Epinikia*.³⁷ In fact, they show a broad range of lyric metres. The commoner ones are aeolic with iambic and dactylic expansions (Pindar B2, C2, D2, D6-7), and dactylic (Pindar, A1; Erythraean παῖάν to Asclepius; Sophocles' παῖάν). We also find dactylo-epitrite (Pindar, D5; Bacchylides, fr. 4; Simonides, *PMG* 519, fr. 41; Ariphron's παῖάν to Health, *PMG* 813); and paroemiacs (Spartan παῖάν to Euros = *PMG* 585). Cult παῖάνες from later centuries show a similar range of metres: the Erythraean παῖάν to Seleukos (*CA* 140) seems to be in dactylo-epitrite; Macedonicus' παῖάν (*CA* 138) is in some sort of dactylic metre (cf. also *PMG* 937); Isyllus' παῖάν is in ionic, and

³⁴ *PMG* 950(a) *Δαλογενὲς εἶτε Λυκίαν* () ('Delos-born, or Lycian . . .'), and (b) *χρυσεοκόμα Ἑκατε παῖ Διός* ('Golden-haired Hekatos, son of Zeus'). These lines could be from Simonides: see Rutherford (1990), 194-5 n. 88.

³⁵ Merkelbach (1973c) (taking it as paeonic); West (1980); (1982), 68 ff. taking it as syncopated iambic; also Führer (1976); Pretagostini (1980) criticizes West. According to Heph. *Enklh.* 13. 7, 42. 23 Consbruch, whole songs of Bacchylides were written in cretic rhythm (fr. 16 Maehler), but we do not know the genre of these. For a discussion of the genre of the song see pp. 73, 98-9; and D. Schmidt (1990).

³⁶ Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134 D-E; Hiller (1886), 414 ff. Some take the reference here to be to the παῖάν ἐπίβατος, but in the context of the παῖάν this seems unnecessary. Thaletas and the ὑπορχήματα: Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 149 = Strabo 10. 4. 16.

³⁷ Pindar, *Paianes*: Metrical Appendix; Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 32; see Rutherford (1990), 206 ff. Pindar, *Epinikia*: note in particular the paeonic-looking syncopated iambic of *Ol.* 2.

ionic also shows up in the refrains of Philodamus' παιάν to Dionysus, although the main parts of the strophe are in aeolic. A fragmentary παιάν of the imperial period published by Schubart (now *GDRK* 52) seems to be made up of spondees. Finally, according to aetiology going back probably as far as Heracleides of Pontus, fr. 158 Wehrli, the iambic trimeter was invented when Apollo chanted the παιάν-cry three times in succession, so this provides a point of contact between the παιάν and stichic iambic.³⁸

The almost total absence of cretic-paeonic remains a problem. It would be possible to argue that cretic-paeonic metre belonged to a simple form of the παιάν, perhaps specially associated with Delphi or Crete, which is not well represented in the surviving fragments of literary παιάνες. The artistic παιάν of the fifth century BC could then be thought of as having dispensed with, or transcended, this earlier, more exuberant form (roughly Deubner's view).³⁹ But it is also possible that the παιάν's connection with cretic dance-rhythms was never deeply rooted. The term which seems more entrenched is 'cretic', but that appears to be primarily associated with the ὑπόρχημα; the term παιών, which need not predate fifth-century musicological theory, refers to a special form of cretic and may owe its name to the similarity frequently observed between the ὑπόρχημα and the παιάν. In the classical period, I would suggest, the association between παιάν and cretic-paeonic was only tangential (just like the relationship between the παιάν and the ὑπόρχημα itself); but it may have taken hold later on when the metrical term παιών was interpreted as a generic requirement, and that would be the context in which the two Delphic παιάνες were composed.

(g) Musical accompaniment

Performances of παιάνες were accompanied by music. The αὐλός emerges from our sources as the most common instrument; the ancient view is well summed up by Plutarch (*Sump. probl.* 713 A): συνεπιφθέγγεται (ὁ αὐλός) τῷ παιᾶνι τὸ θεῖον ('The αὐλός adds a divine refrain to the paeon'). One late source even specifies a type of αὐλός specially linked with the παιάν, the Πυθικός.⁴⁰ Accompaniment by

³⁸ The observation that dactylic or dactylo-iambic metres were specially cultic is made by Ax (1932) in his discussion of the parodos of Soph. *OT*. The testimony of Heracleides is presented in §3 n. 8.

³⁹ Deubner (1919), 406.

⁴⁰ See Archil. *IEG* 121; Pind. F6; D3. 94 (sacrificial context); D7. 11; implied in A1. 36; also in G9. 3; Soph. *Tr.* 216 ff.; Eur. *Tro.* 126; Plut. *De E ap. Delph.* 394 c (the αὐλός was originally used only with dirges and sad songs, and the κιθάρα with

the *κιθάρα* seems to be much rarer (one of the few illustrations is provided by the *ἄγων ἀρχαῖος* at Delphi, which Strabo says was made up of *κιθαρωδοί* who sang *παιᾶνες* to Apollo).⁴¹

Poets of the fifth century BC seem to have recognized a number of distinct *ἄρμονίαι* which were not simply distinct forms of scale, like those transmitted by Aristides Quintilianus, but were distinguished in other respects also; for example, they may have had distinct styles of performance or distinct tempos.⁴² Such broader-based differentiations would make it easier to understand why there are some signs of a degree of correlation between *ἄρμονίαι* and lyric genre in the classical period. Thus, Aristoxenus said that Simonides composed *παιᾶνες*, *προσόδια*, and *παρθένεια* in the Dorian mode, surely suggesting that Simonidean practice represented a classical ideal;⁴³ a testimonial fragment (F5 = fr. 67) which attributes to a *ὑπόμνημα* on the *Paianes* the claim that the Dorian was the most solemn of all *ἄρμονίαι* strongly suggests that a Pindaric *Paian* contained a reference to the Dorian *ἄρμονία*, and that Pindar also continued the Simonidean practice of composing *Paianes* in this *ἄρμονία*. Later sources continue the theory that Dorian *ἄρμονία* is associated with solemnity and order.⁴⁴

However, such a correlation is unlikely to have been more than partial, and in fact there are some indications that *παιᾶνες* could be composed in other *ἄρμονίαι* also. First, according to another of the testimonial fragments of Pindar's *Paianes* (F9), the Lydian *ἄρμονία*

the opposite); Xen. *Ana.* 6. 1. 11. The source for the *αὐλὸς Πυθικός* is Pollux 4. 81 (i. 224. 24 Bethe). See Huchzermeyer (1931), 23 ff.

⁴¹ 9. 3. 10; see p. 27. See also *Theognid.* 778; Athen. 696 F (of Alexinus' *παιάν* in honour of Craterus); Polycrates (*FGrH* 588 F 1) said that at the Spartan Huakinthia both *αὐλὸς* and *κιθάρα* were used; there seems to be a reference to a *φόρμιγξ* in S8. 9. Porph. *Vita Pyth.* 32 says that Pythagoras sang the *παιᾶνες* of Thaletas to the *λύρα*.

⁴² For the nature of the modes see e.g. Neubecker (1977), 93 ff.; Chailley (1979), 105 ff.

⁴³ Aristox. fr. 82 Wehrli; according to ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1136 F, *παρθένεια* by Simonides, Bacchylides, and Pindar were in the Dorian mode (other genres as well, if the emendation of West (1992a), 33, is right). Other correlations: Plato, *Rep.* 398 E, said that the Mixolydian and Syntonolydian *ἄρμονίαι* were suitable for *θρήνοι* and Arist. *Pol.* 1342^b reports that Philoxenus attempted to compose a *διθύραμβος* in the Dorian *ἄρμονία*, demonstrating that the Phrygian *ἄρμονία* was the only one in which *διθύραμβοι* could be written; according to ps.-Arist. *Prob.* 19. 48, Hypodorian and Hypophrygian *ἄρμονίαι* were inappropriate for dramatic *χοροί*.

⁴⁴ Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1136 F; Plato, *Lach.* 188 D; Abert (1899), 80 ff. Cleonides, *Isog.* 13 (206. 3 ff. Jan), contrasts three musical modes: *διασταλτικόν* ('elevating'), associated with tragedy, *συσταλτικόν* ('contracting'), associated with love songs, and *ἡσυχαστικόν* ('calming'), associated with *παιᾶνες*, *ὕμνοι*, and similar genres.

was invented at the wedding of Niobe, and again the reference makes best sense if the song was designed to be performed to an accompaniment of the same *ἄρμονία*. The Lydian *ἄρμονία* was regarded as suitable for dirges (thus, Olympus of Lydia's *ἐπικήδειον*, which purported to be a lament over the body of Python, was in the Lydian mode), and so was not at all like the Dorian. Secondly, in the opening of G9 Pindar seems to say that Xenocritus of Locri composed a *παῖάν* in the Locrian *ἄρμονία*. The nature of this is unclear (later sources identify it with the Aeolian *ἄρμονία*), but it was at any rate different from the Dorian.⁴⁵

The musical notation that accompanies the *παῖνες* of Athenaios and Limenios provides our most extensive evidence for Greek music, allowing us to establish that the former (which has vocal musical notation) spans the Phrygian *τόνος* and the Hyperphrygian *τόνος*, while the latter (which has instrumental musical notation) is written in the Lydian *τόνος* and the Hypolydian *τόνος*. The ethnic terminology is suggestive, but unfortunately the *τόνοι* are simply keys, abstract scale types, without the idiosyncrasies of tuning, tempo, pitch, and style which probably characterised the *ἄρμονίαι*; any similarity between their names and those of the old *ἄρμονίαι* is superficial, a mere vestige of the earlier system. The musical range of both poems is very similar: in each case a range of about an octave and a half. The difference in notation—instrumental notation in the case of Limenios, vocal in the case of Athenaios—suggests that an instrument played a more direct part in the performance of Limenios' song, but it is difficult to be sure.⁴⁶

Cut off from the musical traditions that produced the music for these songs, we have no chance of appreciating their aesthetic qualities, or of hearing them as they were heard when first performed. For Winnington-Ingram, some parts suggested an early scale used for ritual purposes called the *σπονδείον*, associated with Olympus of Lydia, but this is a shot in the dark, given the rift that seems to have

⁴⁵ Lydian *ἄρμονία*: Abert (1899), 92 ff.; ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1136 c. Locrian *ἄρμονία*: see pp. 383–4 *apropos* of G9.

⁴⁶ The *τόνοι*: Pöhlmann (1970); Neubecker (1977), 149–50; Chailley (1979), 154 ff.; West (1992b), 293 ff. The musical notation of the Delphic *παῖνες*: Bélis (1988), arguing that the first has more complex music and was performed by a *χορός* without accompaniment, while the second was performed by a *χορός* with accompaniment; *contra*, West (1992b), 300, explaining the instrumental notation of the second by the argument that Limenios was a professional citharist, so was probably used to the technique.

separated the later music from the earlier.⁴⁷ More plausibly, West has recently suggested that certain musical phrases are intended to imitate the meaning of the words. In both songs, at the point where the poet describes Delphi as having twin peaks, the melodic line itself rises and falls twice, as if in imitation of the shape of the mountain; and in Limenios' song the word *δικόρυφον*, where the four syllables were sung to the notes a-b-a-c, violates an otherwise consistent principle of Greek music, that no syllable is pitched higher than the accented syllable. He also thinks that the sequences of notes corresponding to the word *συρίγματα* in each song, which referred to the hissings of the Delphic dragon, are meant to suggest the sound. This sort of musical *μίμησης* of meaning could well have been a feature of classical *παιάν* performance also.⁴⁸

As far as classical sources go, the common thread is the link with the calm, Dorian mode. A contrast is sometimes found between calm singing of the *παιάν* and the exuberant or even disorderly *διθύραμβος*. This antithesis can be traced back as far as Philochorus (fr. 172), who said that libations were originally accompanied by drunken songs in honour of Dionysus and calm singing in honour of Apollo. But its classic formulation is in Plutarch's *De E apud Delphos*, 389 A-B:

καὶ ᾄδουσι τῷ μὲν διθυραμβικὰ μέλη παθῶν μεστὰ καὶ μεταβολῆς πλάνην τινὰ καὶ διαφόρησιν ἔχούσης, “μυξοβόαν” γὰρ Αἰσχυλὸς φησι “πρέπει διθύραμβον ὁμαρτεῖν σύγκωμον Διούσῳ”, τῷ δὲ παιᾶνα, τεταγμένην καὶ σώφρονα μούσαν.

(To the one they sing dithyrambic songs full of emotions and meandering variation—with mixed shouts, as Aeschylus says [*TrGF* iii. 355], the dithyramb with the revel should accompany Dionysus—while to the other they sing the paean, an ordered and temperate song.)

Plutarch's formulation must be treated with caution: his contrast between unity and multiplicity is probably influenced by philosophical and mystical thought which is alien to the fifth century

⁴⁷ Winnington-Ingram (1928); (1936), 22 ff. The *σπονδεῖον* scale was similar in spirit to the Dorian mode, and was regarded as appropriate to psychological healing; it lacked the *λίχανος* (second note from the top of a tetrachord), an absence which is paralleled by certain sections of the Delphic *παιᾶνες*: see ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134 F; Iambli. *Vita Pyth.* 25. 111–12; West (1981), 117; Gamberini (1979), 193 ff.; Barker (1984), 255 ff.

⁴⁸ West (1992b), 201, 289, 294 (*δικόρυφον*). For *συρίγματα* in the Delphic *παιᾶνες*: West (1992b), 292 (first), 298 (second).

BC.⁴⁹ Still, the contrast itself goes back to the fourth century BC at least. Presumably it reflects a more general contrast between the *παιάν*, symbol of political orderliness, and the *διθύραμβος*, symbol of emotional disorder (because of the association of Dionysus with wine and ecstasy) or even political subversion (in so far as the Dionysiac group could be taken as a threat to political authority, a pattern dramatized in Euripides' *Bacchae*). (For this contrast see further pp. 87–9.)

8. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE *παιάν* IN ITS GENERIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

(a) *The problem of unity*

In §1 I raised the problem of 'coherence' of the genre. Some features show coherence: a *παιάν* is a song addressed to 'Paian', who is an old Greek god, connected with war and usually identified with Apollo; and *παιάνες* tend to be performed by groups of males, often *ἑφηβοί*, who have a special interest in the area of life represented by Paian and Apollo.¹

However, we have seen that in the fifth century BC the term *παιάν* was applied to songs performed with a wide range of functions. Since it seems a reasonable demand that one genre should have a single function, or at least a group of related ones, one might feel inclined to abandon the search for a single model for the genre, and to opt instead for the idea of a loose federation of subgenres (the Apolline *παιάν*, the *παιάν*-prayer, the *παιάν* of celebration, perhaps the military *παιάν* as well), interrelated by family resemblances but with no single key feature or features uniting all of them. These different types might have arisen from a single original form (e.g. the military *παιάν*), but by the classical period they would not have enough in common for us to regard them as a single genre.

Scholars have attempted to solve this problem of functional diversity by giving a privileged position to a single function, to which all the others are then reduced. The most promising candidate is the function of apotropaic prayer and healing. After all, the divine name 'Paian' is interpreted as meaning 'healer', so if the *παιάν* was originally a song addressed to him, it might seem likely that its

⁴⁹ Perhaps Pythagorean: cf. *De Iside et Osiride*, 381 F; Stoic mediation is suggested by Chrysippus, *SVF* ii, fr. 1095.

¹ *ἑφηβοί*: §6a. Invocation of *παιάν*: §7a.

original purpose was to obtain salvation from a deity capable of providing it. Ancient eidographic sources stress the 'healing' function, and Proclus in his description of the genre takes it to be the single central feature (more important even than the connection with Apollo).² This is the thinking that underlies Fairbanks's hypothesis that the apotropaic *παῖάν* was the ur-form of the *παῖάν*.³ And a similar direction has been taken recently by Lutz Käppel, who believes that the essence of a *παῖάν* is an implied dialogue dramatizing a transaction between speaking subject and deity, in which the former prays, invoking the deity under the title 'Paian' (i.e. 'healer') and presenting the *παῖάν* as an offering, in the expectation or hope that the deity will return help. The implication of this model is that the *παῖάν* is a sort of sacrificial offering dedicated to the deity in the expectation of reward.⁴

While for apotropaic *παῖάνες* the applicability of Käppel's formula is not contentious, it is harder to make it work for other forms, such as *παῖάνες* performed in contexts of jubilation. One might argue that these are basically prayers too, where the object of the prayer is continuation of prosperity and the aversion of bad luck. But the 'celebratory' aspect of the *παῖάν* seems to me too deeply rooted for such an indirect explanation. And many passages of Greek literature attest that the *παῖάν* is primarily a positive and celebratory form of song, readily contrasted with sombre forms, like the dirge.⁵ Furthermore, the *παῖάν*-cry, which is analogous in form and function to the *παῖάν*-song, seems generally to have been an expression of celebration, and only rarely a prayer for help.⁶ I therefore have difficulty with the idea that the refrain always represents part of a precatory transaction. Käppel in fact plays down the evidence for the 'celebratory' *παῖάν*.⁷ Another group of *παῖάνες* that pose a problem for Käppel's analysis are cult *παῖάνες* in praise of Apollo and an associated hero, which are largely taken up by the narrative. Prayer could be part of the function of these, but it is hardly all of it. I therefore reject the hypothesis that all *παῖάνες* are

² Proclus on the *παῖάν*: p. 104.

³ Fairbanks (1900), 14–17.

⁴ Käppel (1992b), 64. A late source does indeed speak of Pindar 'sacrificing a *παῖάν*'—see pp. 324–5 n. 78.

⁵ Key pieces of evidence, like the *παῖάνες* of Demetrius of Phaleron (R58), or the *παῖάν* celebrating Lysander's victory (R35), are mentioned in the catalogue of *testimonia* at the end of his book, but not introduced in the discussion of genre.

⁶ *παῖάν*-cry and *παῖάν*-song: §3.

⁷ This criticism of Käppel is made in Dickie (1993), 102–3.

apotropaic prayers or dramatized precatory transactions between deity and worshipper.

(b) *A new solution: the social significance of the communal, Apolline παιάν*

Do we then have to give up any attempt to find a coherent formulation? I think not. In the remainder of §8 I offer a different approach.

παιᾶνες are usually performed by a group of men, not by soloists or by women (the female utterance corresponding to the *παιάν*-cry is the *ὀλολυγή*). In war, performance of the *παιάν* is an expression of solidarity among soldiers, with uses both before and after battle. (The antiquity of the military uses of the *παιάν* is suggested by the Knossos tablet, KN V 52, that links Paian/Paiawon with Enualios.) In peacetime performance of the *παιᾶνες* is an icon for solidarity among male members of the community, both at home, at festivals like the Spartan Gumnopaidia and in the context of institutions such as the Delphinion and at the *συμπόσιον*, and abroad on pilgrimages to regional and national sanctuaries. Both in war and in peace, men performing the *παιάν* act on behalf of the polis as a whole.⁸

Some features of performance were consistent. One example is a recognizable stamping or marching, which in some cases amounted to dance; even *παιάν* performance by soldiers in wartime might have involved movements of this sort, though we would have to make an exception of performance at the *συμπόσιον*, where the performers were reclining. The music that accompanied paeanic song-dance performance was also distinctive. Furthermore, an identifiable range of moods was associated with paeanic song-dance performances: they were orderly, dignified, and serene (as study of the types of music associated with the genre shows), and projected an attitude of controlled celebration and concerted strength, even when the performance served an apotropaic function. In these respects, the mood of the *παιάν* seems to reflect the qualities symbolized by Apollo himself.⁹

These observations about performance suggest a hypothesis about the cultural significance of the genre. Paeanic song-dance performance cannot be divorced from the society in which it flour-

⁸ Performance: §6*b*; Paian and Enualios: §2.

⁹ Dance: §6*b*. Music and mood: §7*g*.

ished. It represents the organization and exhibition of the collective strength of the adult males, particularly those of military age, presenting them in such a way as to emphasize their relationship with the deity Paian/Apollo, who was a guardian and icon for this group. Such performances were perceived as promoting the safety and stability of the polis (which had a special dependence on the collective strength of the adult males), whether the immediate function is galvanizing an army for battle, invoking divine help for healing or to avert catastrophe, worshipping Apollo on a pilgrimage to one of his sanctuaries, commemorating great military victories of the past, or celebrating a wedding. The cultural significance of the *παιάν*, I would suggest, directly reflects both the groups of youthful males who perform it and also the image of Apollo, in whose honour they perform. Key ideas that contribute to it include collective male strength, social cohesion, the assertion of the strength of the community over the forces that threaten it, the world of the living as opposed to the world of the dead, and finally celebration. Even when the performance context is apotropaic, *παιᾶνες* symbolize the mobilization of the community in the face of the danger.

(c) *Generic definition and demarcation*

To focus this picture, I draw attention to the tendency of ancient sources to present the Apolline *παιάν* as standing in an oppositional relationship on the one hand to the chthonic (which translates in generic terms into the dirge) and on the other hand to the wilder Dionysiac (the *διθύραμβος*, in the code of genre).

The antithesis to the lower chthonic world of the dead is underwritten by Apollo's special relationship to the upper Olympian world, and also by the association between the *παιάν* and healing. Admittedly, this pattern admits exceptions, in that *παιᾶνες* are occasionally represented as used in the cult of chthonic deities, heroes, and dead warriors, and from the fourth century BC they were sometimes used in the cults of dead potentates. But these cases can be explained in special ways (*παιᾶνες* to heroes may be healing prayers; *παιᾶνες* in commemoration of dead warriors celebrate their virtue and encourage a new generation of warriors to perform heroic acts; some of the apparent examples are probably to be explained as literary adaptations). In any case, the evidence for an antithesis between *παιάν* and chthonic is overwhelming.¹⁰

¹⁰ *παιάν* and chthonic: §5e.

In the code of genre, a contrast can be drawn between the *παιάν* and the dirge (*γῶος*, *θρήνος*). The function of the dirge is to mourn the dead; its focus is in the world below. The *παιάν*, on the other hand, is excluded from the chthonic, and even when the *παιάν* is performed in honour of the dead, the focus is on this world. Thus, in the same ceremony or festival, an earlier mournful stage can be expressed through the dirge, while a later stage, when the feelings of those involved have transcended mourning and turn back towards this life, or even towards celebration, may be expressed through the *παιάν*. A further point of contrast is provided by the fact that whereas the *παιάν* was a men's song, the dirge—particularly the *γῶος* but perhaps also the *θρήνος*—is especially associated with the communal voice of women.¹¹

Equally significant is the contrast sometimes drawn between the *παιάν* and the *διθύραμβος*, primarily the Dionysiac form, although this applies to the narrative form of the genre also. We saw earlier that there is evidence (from Philochorus and Plutarch) for a contrast between the music involved in each of the genres: paeanic music is represented as orderly, dithyrambic music as wilder.¹² And that insight is supported by what we know of Dionysus himself, whom modern scholars tend to see as a god of paradox, reversal, and transgression.¹³ If genre reflected deity, dithyrambic song-dance performances might have tended to represent the subversion of social and political norms, or at least their relaxation. And in that case there would be a clear contrast with the much stabler and polis-orientated *παιάν*. (Modern readers who may be used to Nietzsche's contrast between the Apolline and the Dionysiac in *The Birth of Tragedy* have to beware that Nietzsche's idea that the Apolline implies individuation of self against the community is misleading in this respect.¹⁴)

This generic contrast may have worked in other dimensions as well. One may have been that of gender: Dionysus tends to be associated with women (Proetids, Thyiades, Euripidean Bacchantes, maenads in general), whereas the *παιάν* is mostly a male form.

¹¹ For the dirge see Reiner (1938); Alexiou (1974). For women's voices and the dirge Reiner (1938), 53 ff.; Alexiou (1974), 10 ff.

¹² Two types of *διθύραμβος*: p. 98 n. 19; contrast between paeanic and dithyrambic music: §7g.

¹³ Modern perceptions of Dionysus are well summarized by Goldhill (1987), 76.

¹⁴ Nietzsche may have been influenced by Plutarch's idea that Apollo symbolizes singularity (*ἀ-πολύς*), continued in Proclus' notion of the *νόμος* (see pp. 102–4).

Another dimension where it played itself out may have been in the polarity life–death (=Olympian–chthonic). We saw that παιάν and chthonic are mostly antithetical; in so far as Dionysus symbolizes the exuberant renewal of life, a similar contrast between διθύραμβος and chthonic might suggest itself. But in fact Dionysus has a chthonic face as well: according to some traditions, he was mortal, and Delphi even claimed to be the site of his grave. Dionysiac tolerance for the chthonic is also shown by the fact that the theme of a famous διθύραμβος by Pindar was the descent of Heracles to the underworld (fr. 70b).¹⁵

For a rare glimpse into how the relationship between the παιάν and the διθύραμβος might have been perceived in the fifth century, we can turn to the extraordinary opening of Bacchylides, *Ode* 16, in which the speaking subject presents his song—a διθύραμβος—as being performed during the period of greatest Dionysiac intensity just before Apollo returns to Delphi to be greeted by παιᾶνες:¹⁶

Ἰδ' ἔκη παιγόνων
 ἄνθεα πεδοιχνεῖν
 10 Πύθι' Ἀπολλων
 τόσα χοροὶ Δελφῶν
 — σὸν κελάδῃσαν παρ' ἀγακλέα ναόν. πρὶν γε κλέομεν λιπεῖν
 Οἰχαλίαν πυρὶ δαπτομέναν
 15 Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδαν θρασυμηδέα φῶθ', ἔκετο δ' ἀμφικύμον' ἄκταν . . .

(. . . you come to seek flowers of παιᾶνες, Pythian Apollo, such as the χοροὶ of Delphians sang beside your glorious temple. But before that, we sing how the son of Amphitryon, the bold mortal, left blazing Oechalia, and came to a beach washed by waves . . .)

A short narrative relates the story of Heracles and Deianeira in a somewhat elliptical manner: after the sack of Oechalia, Heracles went to Mt Kenaion, where he offered sacrifice (antistrophe), and Deianeira in jealousy over Iole sent him a robe dipped in the poison of Nessus (epode). The death itself is not described: thus, the manner of presentation of the story, without its climax, seems to reflect the purported cultic context, anticipation of the return of Apollo. On the level of genre, Bacchylides intends a correlation between

¹⁵ Dionysus on death: Otto (1981), 137–42; Heraclitus B 15, with Kahn (1979), 264–5; Her. 2. 123. 1; Cole (1993); Henrichs (1993). Tomb at Delphi: Call. fr. 643 (cf. fr. 517); Euphorion, fr. 14 van Groningen; Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 7; Plut. *De Iside et Osiride*, 365 A, *De E ap. Delph.* 389 A; Pind., fr. 70b: connected with fr. 346 (initiation of Heracles in underworld) by van der Weiden (1991), 94 ff.

¹⁶ Zimmermann (1992), 70 ff.; Burnett (1985), 123 ff.; Platter (1994).

his song, which he probably thought of as a narrative *διθύραμβος* (as did the Hellenistic editors)—and the ‘Dionysiac’ period of Apollo’s absence from Delphi. The implied Dionysiac context of the genre accommodates the deployment of the themes of social transgression and disaster (like the story of Deianeira summarized in Bacch. *Ode* 16, or the story of Perseus in Pindar, fr. 70c). And if, as I suggested earlier, death and the chthonic can be seen as a Dionysiac theme, this would be particularly true at Delphi, the supposed burial-place of Dionysus.

To sum up, the significance of paeanic song-dance performance can best be appreciated against the background of a broad framework of categories of social activity which underpin and animate the concept of distinct genres. The Apolline *παιάν* is defined by its correlation with support of the polis, political and social order, life and healing, and finally the male; social practices which fall outside these categories tend to be correlated with other deities and with other forms of song-dance performance, the *διθύραμβος* and the *θρῆνος*. To understand genre is to understand the social categories which engender it.

The communal, Apolline *παιάν* accommodates many of the functions listed in §5: the apotropaic *παιάν*, at least in many of its manifestations, the use of the *παιάν* in war and to express ritually correct utterance or celebration. Other functions will have to be considered as peripheral with respect to this core: the *συμπόσιον-παιάν*, for example, shares with the communal Apolline *παιάν* its communal male performance, but the addressee need not be the same. Again, the *παιάν* to Asclepius resembles the communal Apolline *παιάν* at least in so far as Asclepius is in the same general area as Apollo, and some of this type may have been performed by groups of men. Finally, the *παιάν* in honour or commemoration of men seems to be a by-product of the victory *παιάν*. Besides these peripheral functions, which are well established in the classical period, there are also a number of variant functions which emerge only in the post-classical world, chief among them the *παιάν* in praise of living kings and generals, and some artistic variations.¹⁷

This model of core and periphery is meant as a description of the synchronic distribution of paeanic functions. It does not imply that the core Apolline *παιάν* is earlier and the peripheral func-

¹⁷ *παιάνες* to kings and generals: §5j. Artistic variations: §12.

tions later. Nevertheless, such an idea of chronological development might well be roughly correct. Of the peripheral forms, only the *συνπόσιον-παιάν* seems to go back to the archaic period. The Asclepian *παιάν* develops relatively late, as does the *παιάν* in commemoration of men.

9. THE PROBLEM OF DISTINCTIVENESS: THE SOURCES OF EIDOGRAPHIC INDETERMINACY

Given that scholars of the Hellenistic and Roman periods were sometimes themselves in doubt about whether or not a song was a *παιάν*, it can be argued that we are in no position to assert that the *παιάν* is distinct from other lyric genres even in the classical period. These are the principal cases of what I call eidographic indeterminacy:

1. Aristotle's song in honour of Hermias (*PMG* 842), which was probably performed at a *συνπόσιον*, and was therefore thought by some to be a *παιάν*, though others thought that it was a *σκόλιον*.
2. *POxy* 2368 (= *SH* 293), a fragment of a *ὑπόμνημα*, illustrates how two editors disagreed on the classification of a certain song, often thought to be by Bacchylides (though it could just as easily be by Pindar): Callimachus thought that it was a *παιάν*, while Aristarchus thought that it was a *διθύραμβος*.
3. Proclus, *Chrestomathia*, 320^a24–5, reports that the name *παιάν* is sometimes falsely applied to *προσόδια*.
4. Ps.-Plutarch, *De musica*, 1134 E, perhaps drawing on Heraclides of Pontus, says that the compositions of Xenocritus of Locri were either *παιᾶνες* or *διθύραμβοι*.
5. Ps.-Plutarch, *De musica*, 1134 C, reports that the songs of Xenodamus of Cythera were either *παιᾶνες* or (according to Pratinas) *ὑπορχήματα*.
6. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, discussing Pindar's song on the eclipse of the sun, usually regarded as a *παιάν* (A1), identifies it as a *διθύραμβος* or a *ὑπόρχημα*.

Eidographic indeterminacy is perhaps implied in the following cases:

7. Aristonoos' song in honour of Apollo (*CA* 162), which seems

to be a *παῖάν* from the point of view of form, is called a *ῥῆμος* in the title.

8. Alcaeus' song in honour of Apollo (fr. 307b) is referred to as a *παῖάν* by Himerius, as a *ῥῆμος* in ps.-Plutarch, *De musica*, and as a *προοίμιον* by Pausanias.¹
9. According to Plato, Socrates composed a *προοίμιον* to Apollo, but Diogenes Laertius, who cites what he claims is the first line, calls it a *παῖάν*.²

The uncertainties that we find in Hellenistic sources about whether or not songs were *παῖανες* probably arose from three main sources. First, an important element in the concept both of the *παῖάν* and of the other genres was performance scenario and/or function and/or manner of performance, but Hellenistic classifiers placed more emphasis on formal and thematic aspects. And in so far as they acknowledged the eidographic implications of performance and function, their knowledge of them was in some respects limited, and inferences they made on this basis are inevitably sometimes unreliable. Secondly, the Hellenistic strategy of assigning every song to one of a series of wholly distinct genres is to some extent out of step with the generic economy of song of the fifth century BC, in which such categories, though conceptually distinct, are frequently found to overlap in their application to individual songs, in such a way that a single song could simultaneously instantiate more than one type. The second point has the important methodological corollary that the *παῖάν* was not a fully independent category of song in the classical period. Thirdly, we have to allow for the possibility that even in the classical period poets may have allowed themselves some degree of freedom in manipulating generic conventions, and that generic theory may in some respects have lagged behind innovating generic practice.

In this section I shall examine most of the cases of eidographic indeterminacy listed above, dividing them into (a) cases of confusion of general and specific terms (nos. 7–9 above); (b) the Hermias-song (no. 1); (c) *POxy* 2368 (no. 2); (d) cases reported by ps.-Plutarch (nos. 4–5); and finally (e) Proclus (no. 3). I defer no. 6 until I discuss *A1*.

¹ Himer. *Or.* 48. 10; ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1135 F; Paus. 10. 8. 10.

² Plato, *Phaedo*, 60 c–d, D.L. 2. 42, who cites the first line of the song and reports that a certain Dionysodorus doubted its authenticity.

(a) *General terms and specific terms*

We can begin by eliminating the cases in which a song can be referred to as either a παιάν or a ὕμνος or a προοίμιον (nos. 7–9). These are not true cases of ambiguity in classification, because ὕμνος is being used as a general term for a song in praise of a deity, and the cult παιάν falls within that definition. This usage is found in some classical sources, while Hellenistic generic classification oscillates between a broader use of ὕμνος as a general term for religious song and a narrower application as a default category for any religious song which did not fall naturally into any other category.³ Similarly, the term ἐγκώμιον earlier meant any song in praise of men, while in the Hellenistic period it becomes specialized in the sense of a song of praise performed at a συμπόσιον, for which the earlier term was σκόλιον.⁴

The confusion of προοίμιον and παιάν in nos. 8 and 9 will be analogous to that between ὕμνος and παιάν if (as seems to be the case) προοίμιον, though a term of complex history and special nuance, is here being used as a synonym for ὕμνος.⁵

(b) *Aristotle's Hermias-song*

To move on to the more complex cases, Aristotle's song in honour of Hermias of Atarneus (no. 1) survives, and it is worth citing in full (PMG 842):⁶

Ἄρετὰ πολύμοχθε γένει βροτείῳ, θήραμα κάλλιστον βίῳ,
σᾶς πέρι, παρθένε, μορφᾶς καὶ θανείν ζηλωτὸς ἐν Ἑλλάδι πότμος
καὶ πόνους τλῆναι μαλεροῦς ἀκάμαντας·
τοῖον ἐπὶ φρένα βάλλεις καρπὸν ἰσαθάνατον χρυσοῦ τε κρείσσω
καὶ γονέων μαλακαυγήτοιό θ' ὕπνου.
σεῦ δ' ἔνεκεν (καὶ) ὁ δῖος Ἡρακλῆς Λήδας τε κούροι

³ Broader use in the 5th cent. BC: Pind. C2. 10; Eur. *Her.* 695. Broader use in Hellenistic criticism: Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a14 ff.; *EM* 777. 9 (=Didymus, 4. 9. 3, 389 Schmidt); and Orion, *Et.* 155. 22 (ed. Sturz (1820) = Färber (1936), 28). Narrower use in Hellenistic criticism: e.g. Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a19–20, cited below, n. 39; cf. the distinction between genre (broader category) and mode (narrower category) in Fowler (1982).

⁴ The earlier sense is represented by Plato, *Rep.* 607 A 4, and continued in Aphth. *Progymn.* 8. This shift in terminology is linked with the development of the term ἐπινίκιον for a praise-song celebrating athletic success, and the narrowing of the term σκόλιον. See Harvey (1955), 162–4; Severyns (1934).

⁵ The προοίμιον: Koller (1956); Nagy (1990), 353.

⁶ Mostly following Page's colometry. The sources are Athen. 696 A–697 B; D.L. 5. 6 ff.; Didymus, in Pearson and Stephens (1983), 6. 18 ff. I would like to thank Prof. Ernst Badian for a helpful discussion of the Hermias-song.

πόλλ' ἀνέτλασαν ἐν ἔργοις σὰν †[. . .] ἐποντες δύναμιν†
 σοῖς τε πόθοις Ἀχιλεὺς Αἴας τ' Αἴδαο δόμους ἦλθον·
 σᾶς δ' ἔνεκεν φίλιον μορφᾶς Ἀταρνέος ἔντροφος ἀελίου χήρωσεν αὐγὰς.
 τοιγὰρ ᾠοιδίμος ἔργοις, ἀθάνατόν τέ μιν αὐξήσουσι Μοῦσαι,
 Μναμοσύνας θυγάτρες, Διὸς ξενίου σέβας αὔξουσai φιλίας τε γέρας βεβαίον.

(Virtue, full of labour for the mortal race, loveliest prize for life, for your form, virgin, even death is a sought-after fate in Greece and worth enduring fierce labours without tiring. Such is the fruit that you cast before the heart—equal to the immortals, greater than gold, than parents, and sleep soft to the eyes. For your sake divine Heracles and the sons of Leda dared many labours . . . Through desire for you Achilles and Ajax went to the house of Hades. For the sake of your dear form the native of Atarneus lost the light of the sun. Hence he is to be sung for his deeds, and the Muses will make him immortal, the daughters of Mnemosyne, increasing the reverence of Zeus god of strangers and the prerogative of sure friendship.)

The song begins with an address to Arete, but it ends as a compliment to Hermias, tyrant of Atarneus and Assus in Asia Minor, a philosopher and friend of Aristotle, who had died about 345–344 BC.⁷ The ancient tradition was that the hierophant Eurymedon suborned the rhetor Demophilos of Acharnae to prosecute Aristotle for impiety on the grounds that he paid divine honours to Hermias, and the case was wholly or partly based on the allegation that the song was a *παιάν* and that Aristotle had it performed at *συμπόσια*.⁸ I see no reason to suppose that the accusation is not historical, and that it was not largely religious in motivation, since Eurymedon was a hierophant. Compare the part played by inappropriate *παιάν*-singing in Aeschines' *On the False Embassy*, where Aeschines defends himself against the charge that his joining in singing the *παιάν* with Philip showed treacherous solidarity with him, though in that case the issue is political and not religious.⁹ The date of the accusation will presumably have been soon after Aristotle's return to Athens in 335 BC. Whether Demophilus won the case, or whether, if he did,

⁷ For the sources on Hermias (not Hermeias: see *SIG* 229) see Düring (1957), 272 ff.; Wormell (1935).

⁸ Athen. 696 B, drawing at least partly on Hermippus the Callimachean, fr. 48 (Wehrli (1967–78), supp. 1. 75–6, is sceptical); Didymus, perhaps citing Hermippus, at Diels and Schubart (1904), 6. 19; D.L. 5. 5, citing Favorinus (*FHG* fr. 28 = fr. 68 Barigazzi, *Vita Hesychii*, 6 = Düring (1957), 82). Diogenes says that the case involved also an epigram by Aristotle in honour of Hermias dedicated at Delphi. Diogenes is the only source that does not think that the song is a *παιάν*—he calls it a *ῥυμος*. The subject is discussed by Derenne (1930), 189 ff.

⁹ Aeschin. *Fals. leg.* 162–3; cited on p. 67.

this was the reason for Aristotle's exile from Athens in 323 BC, is unknown.

Our primary source for the generic problem occasioned by the song is from many centuries later. In the closing pages of the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus, the character Democritus, evidently the mouthpiece for a well-established argument, asserts that it was not after all a παιάν, but a σκόλιον, or rather not so much a normal σκόλιον as a *sui generis* formation (696 B). The argument against its being a παιάν is based on two points. First, it has no 'paeanic characteristic' (696 E παιανικὸν ἰδίωμα),¹⁰ since the poet concedes that Hermias is dead (it seems to be presupposed here that παιᾶνες are about the world of the living). Second, it does not have a παιάν-refrain, and to prove that παιᾶνες have the refrain, he lists a number of Hellenistic παιᾶνες in honour of kings and generals. One of these is Alexinus' παιάν in honour of Craterus of Macedonia, and the source for that is said to be Hermippus the Callimachean's *Life of Aristotle* (fr. 48 Wehrli). It is clear from this that the genre of the song was already a topic of dispute in the third century BC.

I would suggest that its genre might have been an issue in the trial itself. If it had happened a generation or two later, the two sides could have drawn on the expert testimony of scholars skilled in literary classification, but in the 330s it seems that this area had not yet been mapped out, and one can imagine that the lack of clear articulation was exploited by both sides. The prosecution's point will presumably have been that a παιάν ought to be dedicated to a god, so that composing or performing one in honour of a man would be impious. But how could they claim that the song was a παιάν at all when it lacks overtly paeanic features? The answer is that they probably concentrated on the circumstances of performance. Athenaeus says that the song was performed at a banquet (696 B). Modern commentators have entertained the alternative hypothesis that it was performed at a memorial ceremony for Hermias along

¹⁰ The term ἰδίωμα in the context of genre also at ps.-Dionys. *Rhet.* 10. 9 (366. 8 U-R) ἐν ιδιώματι κωμωδίας; ps.-Aristid. *Peri Aph. Log.* 64 (trans. in Rutherford (1998b), 138). Usually ἰδίωμα refers to stylistic properties, as frequently in the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, e.g. the title of the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, *Περὶ τῶν Θουκυδίδου ἰδιωμάτων*; its use in Athenaeus for a thematic or functional property seems to be exceptional. For the role of the παιανικὸν ἰδίωμα in Hellenistic eidography see §15.

with the prose encomium of Callisthenes of Olynthus.¹¹ However, I would suggest that Athenaeus' report is an accurate reflection of part of the charge alleged by the prosecution and conceded by the defence.

The prosecution will have argued next that if the song was performed at a *συμπόσιον*, there was a good probability that it might have been a *παιάν*. As we saw earlier (p. 50), *συμπόσιον-παιᾶνες* were usually dedicated to Olympian Zeus, the heroes, and Zeus Soter, but there are precedents for the pattern being transgressed or adapted, e.g. the proem of Pindar, *Isth.* 6, and the *παιάν* to Poseidon that Xenophon says that Agesipolis and the Spartans sang at a *συμπόσιον* on the occasion of an earthquake. The defence could have argued either (1) that the song was not a *παιάν*, or (2) that although it was a *παιάν*, it was not impious to dedicate *παιᾶνες* to men, or (3) that the song was not dedicated to Hermias in any case, and they might have argued a combination of these points. It is point (1) that gets reported in Athenaeus, as we have seen. Athenaeus' alternative suggestion that the song was a *σκόλιον* probably reflects an attempt by the defence to show that even though the song was performed at a *συμπόσιον*, there were other symposiastic genres that it might belong to as well. This argument might have entailed discussion of the different occasions in the *συμπόσιον* appropriate to different genres (is it a coincidence that the classical treatment of this subject goes back to Dicaearchus, another pupil of Aristotle?).¹² I suspect that the defence also argued point (3), since Hermias plays only a very small role in the song.

Point (2) opens up a different issue: was the *παιάν* reserved for gods, or could it be sung to men also? Both views are represented in eidographic sources, the former, for example, in the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus, the latter in Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Georgics* (=F11). The legitimacy of dedicating *παιᾶνες* to men as well as gods would have been easier to maintain in the mid-third century BC, by which time the practice of composing *παιᾶνες* for kings and emperors was well established. However, although there is some evidence for performance of *παιᾶνες* in honour of men in the fourth century BC (e.g. the Lysander-*παιάν*), the link with the divine sphere

¹¹ Wormell (1935), 76; anticipated by Wilamowitz (1893), ii. 405. Callisthenes' *ἐγκώμιον* is *FGrH* 124 F 2 = Diels and Schubart (1904), 5. 64.

¹² See p. 51.

is relatively uncompromised, and I think it is unlikely that the defence attempted to argue this point.¹³

It is unrealistic to think that we can establish the true genre of the Hermias-song, since the text is comparatively uninformative, and since we shall never know the exact circumstances of performance. Two points in favour of its being a σκόλιον are its lack of a παιάν-refrain and the fact that σκόλια are known to have been performed in honour of distinguished men.¹⁴ On the other hand, παιᾶνες too were sung in honour of men, living or dead, from the fourth century BC (see §5i-j). In any case, the real addressee of the song is less likely to be Hermias than the abstract deity Arete. And we have seen that the παιάν-refrain was not a consistent feature of the Pindaric articulation of the genre, nor does it occur in the Delphic παιᾶνες of Limenios and Athenaios, nor is it mentioned in Proclus' sketch of the παιάν. In any case, an extra-textual communal παιάν-cry following the performance of the song could have served the formal purpose of a παιάν-refrain.¹⁵ Another factor that points towards identification as a παιάν is the existence of subtle similarities noticed by Bowra between the Hermias-song and Ariphron's παιάν to Health, which could indicate an intentional generic affiliation.¹⁶ There is a rough parallel in a fragment of Alexis (*PCG* 2. 116), where a character orders libations to be poured in honour of Antigonos, Demetrios, and Aphrodite Philia; this looks like an adaptation of the pattern of three libations customary at the συμπόσιον; and such libations were

¹³ For παιᾶνες and great men see §5i-j, pp. 57-8. In a debate on the deification of Alexander reported by Arr. *Ana.* 4. 10-11, Callisthenes, arguing against deification, calls the παιάν a divine honour (4. 11. 3).

¹⁴ ΣPlato, *Gorg.* 451 E (Carbonara Naddei (1976), 30; Färber (1936), ii. 45-6); see also the references to Harmodius and Aristogeiton in *PMG* 895-6 (two of the *Scolia* cited by Athen. 694 C).

¹⁵ See p. 21. Perhaps the version of the song adduced by the prosecution had a παιάν-cry appended.

¹⁶ Bowra (1938). The overall form of the songs is similar (Ariphron praises Hygieia as a better thing than wealth or parents, Aristotle praises Arete on similar grounds; as Ariphron's song finishes with a reference to the Kharites, so Hermias' song finishes with a reference to the Muses); the metre also shows some similarities (dactylo-epitrite, with a distinctive anapaestic opening); and there are a number of lexical parallels: 1 βροτοῖσι, 7 θηρεύομεν, 8 πόνων, 5 ἰσοδαίμονα, 5 πάθων - Hermias-song 1 γένει βροτέψ, 2 θήραμα, 5 πόνους, 7 ἰσαθάνατον, 12 σοῖς πόθοις. Since Athen. 701 E-702 B represents Ariphron's παιάν as being sung at a συμπόσιον in the 2nd cent. AD, its original context could have been symposiastic. Within the context of the συμπόσιον, Hygieia was specially associated with the μετανιπτρίς, a cup used after dinner: see Antiphanes, *PCG* ii, fr. 147 (*Melanion*); Philetaerus, *PCG* vii, fr. 1 (*Asclepius*); Nicostratus, *PCG* vii, fr. 18 (*Pandrosus*); Hunter (1983), 186.

generally accompanied by *παιᾶνες* (cf. R59–60). All things considered, I am inclined to think that the prosecution might have been right about the genre, though they were perhaps wrong in the claim that performance of the song amounted to the payment of divine honours to the addressee.¹⁷

(c) POxy 2368

The genre-bestowing properties of the *παιάν*-refrain are involved in case (2), but here the issue is not whether its presence is a necessary condition for a song to be classed as a *παιάν*, but whether it is a sufficient condition. This is the text:¹⁸

Ἰλος ὥστε μετὰ προ[]ας ἐρχόμεθα. # Αἶθ[ανᾶν εὐαν]δρονιεράν ἄωτο[ν
ταύτην τ]ήν ᾠδὴν Ἀρίσταρχ(ος) [μὲν διθ]υραμβικὴν εἶ[ναί φησι]ν διὰ τὸ παρει-
λῆ[φθαι ἐν α]ὐτῇ τὰ περὶ Κασ[σάνδρας,]ἐπιγράφει δ' αὐτὴν [καὶ Κασσ]άνδραν,
πλανη[θέντα δ' α]ὐτὴν κατατάξαι [ἐν τοῖς Π]αιᾶσι Καλλιμαχόν [φησιν ὡς]οὐ
συνέετα ὅτι [τὸ ἐπίφθ]ε[χ]μα κοινόν ἐστι καὶ δ[ι]θυράμβου. ὁμοίως δὲ ὁ Φ]α-
σγλίτης Διονύσιος(s). []ειον τέμενος το[]αι τὸ τῆς Ἀθήνας
[]α δ' ἀχῶ κτυπεῖ λι[] αὐλῶν πνοαὶ ἄρε[]τηι τῶν
αὐλῶν []ελικτον δὲ ἀντι[]... τως ἐπεὶ δε[]... ἀρχ...
ἔπειτα []χ]αίρις πρέπει ἕως []ιονων νοο[]

φησιν ὡς, διὰ τὸ ἰγ Lobel τὸ ἐπίφθ]ε[χ]μα Lobel: παραδιῆ]γμα Luppe
(1987); μύθου σύ]στημα Maehler (1997)

(... so that ... we come. **Well-manned flower of holy Athens** ... Aristarchus claims that the song is dithyrambic because it includes the story of Cassandra and he entitles it 'Cassandra', and says that Callimachus made a mistake in classing it among the *Paianes*, not understanding that the refrain is common to dithyrambes also. Equally Dionysius of Phaselis ... the shrine of Athena ... **noise resounds** ... **breath of αὐλοῖ** ... **grace is fitting until** ...)

Aristarchus says that Callimachus thought that the song was a *Paian* because of the refrain; Aristarchus himself thought otherwise, but note that this need not entail that he did not believe that the presence of a comparatively complex *παιάν*-refrain would not imply

¹⁷ I pass over some more complex solutions that have been suggested: Bowra (1938) thinks that the song is a combination of *παιάν* and *θρήνος*; while Renehan (1982) suggests that it is an experiment with dithyrambic elements. For other bibliography see Renehan (1982), 251 n. 1. The Hermias-song need not be the only *συμπόσιον-παιάν* that has been wrongly classified as a *Skolion*: Fabbro (1986) argues that some of the songs cited by Athen. 694 c as *Skolia* (PMG 884–7) would be better thought of as *Paianes*.

¹⁸ The text was improved by Luppe (1987), but see Käppel and Kannicht (1988); Ucciardello (1996–7).

classification as a *Paian*, because the refrain in the Cassandra-song may have been a small quasi-refrain (like *ἡ ἡ* at the end of Bacchylides' fr. 60). Aristarchus himself classed the song as a *Dithurambos*. Two forms of *διθύραμβος* are known, the Dionysiac and the narrative, and Aristarchus seems to have been thinking of the latter.¹⁹ Most *παιᾶνες* had narratives also, so it would be surprising if Aristarchus presupposed that narratives had no place in the *παιάν*. What Aristarchus' argument was is uncertain, but several interpretations suggest themselves.

First, Aristarchus may have thought that, though a narrative was by no means illegitimate in a *Paian*, it should not occupy the whole of it, or all but the whole of it, like the narrative of a *Dithurambos*.

Alternatively, he may have started from the premiss that a narrative in a *Paian* ought to have something to do with Apollo—relating one of his exploits, or providing an aetiology for one of the cults of Apollo, for example; and it may have been his opinion that the absence of an Apolline narrative said more against the claim that the song was a *Paian* than the presence of a quasi-*παιάν* refrain said in its favour. A distinction of this sort may be implied by Bacchylides, *Ode* 16, which presents itself as a *διθύραμβος* performed before the return of Apollo to Delphi, and implies that a myth like the one it contains—concerning Heracles and Deianeira—is inappropriate to a *παιάν*.²⁰ This is the sort of reasoning that seems to lie behind the classification of Bacchylides, *Ode* 17: its non-Apolline narrative (about Theseus) seems to have persuaded ancient editors to group it with the *Dithuramboi*. However, the closing lines of the song (129 ff.) contain a reference to a Ceian performance linked to the cult of Delian Apollo that suggests that it should be seen as a *παιάν*.²¹

¹⁹ Sources for the Dionysiac *διθύραμβος* are Archil. *IEG* 20; Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 355; Pind. *Ol.* 13. 18; Plato, *Lates*, 700 D; for the narrative *διθύραμβος* see Plato, *Rep.* 394 C; ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134 E; ΣDion. Thrax 451. 21 (ed. Hilgard (1901)); and see Harvey (1955), 173. On the *διθύραμβος* in general see Zimmermann (1992); Pickard-Cambridge (1962), ch. 1; Schönewolf (1938); Hamilton (1990); van der Weiden (1991), 1 ff. D. Schmidt (1990) discusses aetiological narrative.

²⁰ For Bacch. 16 see pp. 88–9.

²¹ Two other factors which seem to point towards the *παιάν* are (1) the coda to the narrative (124–9) in which the young men and women whom Theseus saves utter the appropriate ritual cries of *ὀλολυγή* and *ἡ παιάν*; and (2) the metre (see p. 78). Käppel (1992b) argues that the song is a *παιάν*, suggesting that it might have been intended as a celebration of the Greek victory over the Persians, performed in the 470s by Ceians acting on behalf of the newly formed Athenian league, and that this underlying theme of celebration is reflected in the 'Z' section of the song, where the Athenians are represented as celebrating their delivery from Minos.

(If the song had been a *διθύραμβος*, we would expect it to have been performed at a festival of Dionysus.²²)

However, although some other cases of ambiguity between *Paian* and narrative *Dithurambos* could have arisen in this way, the ambiguity described in *POxy* 2368 may be of a different nature. Since the narrative in the song referred to there had something to do with Cassandra, it is likely that Apollo was after all involved. In that case, we can make a different guess at what Aristarchus' objection might have been: a song relating Apollo's sexual relationship with Cassandra is unlikely to have reflected well on Apollo, so that, as Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood suggests to me, Aristarchus may have judged this story to be inappropriate for a *Paian*—which he may have believed to require praise of Apollo—though not necessarily for a song of a different genre. Callimachus, on the other hand, would seem not to have been concerned that a *Paian* should reflect badly on Apollo—which is interesting, in view of the awareness of the ambiguous nature of the *παῖάν* which he shows in his *Hymn to Apollo*.²³

(d) *Cases in pseudo-Plutarch, De musica*

The *De musica* is a late work, but the account of early Greek music and song that it contains is heavily indebted to earlier sources such as Pratinas of Phleius, Glaukos of Rhegium, and Heracleides of Pontus. In the case of the songs of Xenocritus (no. 4 above), pseudo-Plutarch reports that they were regarded as either *παῖνες* (the view of Pindar in G9) or *διθύραμβοι* in so far as they were 'heroic themes containing actions' (*ἡρωϊκῶν . . . ὑποθέσεων πράγματα ἐχουσῶν*). He does not say why they were regarded as *παῖνες*, but considerations of form or performance scenario will presumably have been involved. The situation is analogous to that discussed above apropos of passage no. 2.²⁴

As for the songs of Xenodamus of Cythera, pseudo-Plutarch, perhaps drawing on the *Συναγωγὴ* of Heracleides, reports that they were generally classed as *παῖνες*, although they were called *ὑπορχήματα* by the early classical poet Pratinas (*PMG* 713 (ii)), himself

²² Narrative *διθύραμβοι* would normally have been performed in the context of contests between competing *χοροί*, held, for example, at the Athenian Dionysia: see O. Crusius, *RE* s.v. *Dithyrambos*, ix. 1216; Hamilton (1990); Froning (1971).

²³ For Callimachus and paeanic ambiguity see pp. 122–3; for *POxy* 2368 and Pindar see pp. 237–8.

²⁴ See the reference to a song of Xenocritus in G9, discussed at pp. 383–4.

an author of at least one ὑπόρχημα (*PMG* 708). He also calls one song by Xenodamus known to him a clear case of a ὑπόρχημα. Perhaps Pratinas somewhere said, 'Other people think that Xenodamus wrote παιᾶνες, but I regard his songs as ὑπορχήματα', in which case this would be the oldest attested case of a dispute about genre. Alternatively, the information that they were παιᾶνες may have a different origin.²⁵

What is the basis for this disagreement likely to have been? Certainly, the ὑπόρχημα had much in common with the παιάν: it was linked with Apollo and performed at Delos, and in festivals of Apollo in Sparta; and it is also associated with cretic metre.²⁶ Hence, one might suppose that the terms might sometimes have overlapped in their application to individual songs, picking out different features (performance scenario backed up by formal markers in the case of the παιάν; manner of performance in the case of the ὑπόρχημα). On the other hand, it is equally possible that, though similar, they were for the most part distinct, and the following factors may have been involved: (1) In performances of ὑπορχήματα, dance was thought to be very important (as the name suggests).²⁷ (2) Hyporchematic dances are said to involve μίμησις, in one source specified as μίμησις 'of the subjects conveyed by the words'. Imitation of animals is represented in a fragment of a *Huporkhema* by Pindar.²⁸ (3) If the dances were somewhat wild (one source mentions the κόρδαξ), there could be a further contrast with the calm

²⁵ This passage is ascribed to Heraclides of Pontus by Pohlenz (1926), 312 = (1965), ii. 487. The contribution of Pratinas to literary scholarship is discussed further on p. 146. ὑπορχήματα are linked to Xenodamus also at Athen. 15 D. If Pratinas referred to ὑπορχήματα by Xenodamus in one of his songs, that song might have been a ὑπόρχημα, which might be a reason for trusting the testimony of Athenaeus that Pratinas, *PMG* 708, is a ὑπόρχημα (contra e.g. Seaford (1977–8)).

²⁶ Apollo: Joh. Sard. 119. 21–3 Rabe; Men.Rh. 3. 331. 22 Spengel; Färber (1936), ii. 29; Deubner (1919), 397. Delos: Luc. *De salt.* 16; the same association may lie behind the term Πυθικὴ ψῆς, which Athenaeus (28 A) applies to fr. 106. Sparta: Sosibius Lacon, *FGrH* 595 F 23 = *ΣPyth.* 2. 69 (Dr ii. 53. 2 ff.); for Pindaric examples see §4 n. 34. Cretic metre: *Anonymi Ambrosiani de re metrica* in Studemund (1886), 225. 29; Heph. *Enkl.* 42, 23 Consbruch; Choeroboscus on Heph. 218. 14 and 303. 20 Consbruch uses the term ὑπορχηματικός for a form of the paeon-foot (~~~~).

²⁷ Sosibius Lacon, *FGrH* 595 F 23, links the ὑπόρχημα with the pyrrhic dance; Athen. 630 D links ὑπορχηματική dance with the κόρδαξ (also an Apolline dance in Hellenistic Amorgos: *IG* xii/7. 246); see also Nagy (1990), 351; di Marco (1973–4).

²⁸ ὑπόρχημα as μίμησις: Athen. 1–15 D; Plut. *Sump. probl.* 748 B–C; Pind. fr. 107a (the attribution to Pindar is not certain: Reinach (1898) argued for Bacchylides on the grounds of style; for the colometry see Gallavotti (1962), 38 ff.).

and orderly *παιάν* (compare the contrast between the calm *παιάν* and the agitated *διθύραμβος*).²⁹

The mimetic nature of the *ὑπόρχημα* leads to a speculation about generic theory. An important eidographic parameter in antiquity, attested as early as Plato and Aristotle, and most fully set out by the Roman grammarian Diomedes, had to do with manner of narration: whether a song was mimetic (like drama) or diegetic (like narrative *διθύραμβος*, according to Plato, or didactic poetry, according to Diomedes), or a mixture of the two (like Homeric epic). Although the only lyric genre with an explicit role in this schema is the *διθύραμβος*, the possibility suggests itself that the *ὑπόρχημα* could fit into it also as an instance of a mimetic genre. In that case, the only vacant place in the schema would be the intermediate one, and that might perhaps be occupied by the *παιάν*, which has something in common with both *ὑπόρχημα*, being partly mimetic (e.g. where the *χορός* describe their arrival at the sanctuary), and *διθύραμβος*, being partly diegetic (the myth).³⁰ Schematically:

Mimetic	Mixed	Diegetic
<i>Huporkhema</i>	[<i>Paian</i> ?]	<i>Dithurambos</i>

This model explains nicely why although the *παιάν* can be confused with the *διθύραμβος* (Xenocritus) and with the *ὑπόρχημα* (Xenodamus), confusion between the *διθύραμβος* and the *ὑπόρχημα* seems not to occur.

(e) *Proclus' Chrestomathia*

Finally, I want to turn to problems posed by the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus (probably a grammarian of the early Empire drawing on earlier sources, including Didymus' *Περὶ τῶν λυρικῶν ποιητῶν*, which was in turn closely indebted to earlier Hellenistic scholars, e.g. Apollonios ὁ εἰδογράφος). The *Chrestomathia* is our most complete account of ancient lyric genres, and it divides them into four groups: those addressed to gods (*εἰς θεούς*), those addressed to men (*εἰς ἀνθρώπους*), a mixed category comprising those addressed to both gods and men, and finally types composed in response to particular circumstances (the last Proclus himself claims are not genres

²⁹ κόρδαξ: above, n. 27; see also Pratinas, *PMG* 708, a lively fragment, cited as from a *ὑπόρχημα* by Athen. 617 B.

³⁰ *μίμησις* and *διήγησις*: Plato, *Rep.* 392 D ff.; Arist. *Po.* 1448^a 19 ff.; Diomedes, 1. 482 Keil.

but 'are produced by the poets themselves': 319^b35–20^a9).³¹ Not all of them are discussed at the same length; in Table 2 the asterisk indicates those discussed more extensively.

TABLE 2. *Proclus' Categorization of the Lyric Genres*

εἰς θεούς	εἰς ἀνθρώπους	εἰς θεούς καὶ ἀνθρώπους	εἰς τὰς προσηπιτούσας περιστάσεις
ὕμνος	ἐγκώμιον	παρθένιον	πραγματικόν
προσόδιον	ἐπίνικον [<i>sic</i>]	δαφνηφορικόν*	ἐμπορικόν
παίαν	σκόλιον	τριποδηφορικόν*	ἀποστολικόν
διθύραμβος*	ἐρωτικόν	ὠσχοφορικόν*	γνωμολογικόν
νόμος*	ἐπιθαλάμιον	εὐκτικόν	γεωργικόν
ἁδωνίδιον	ὑμέναιος	ἐπισταλτικόν	
ἰόβακχος	σῖλλος		
ὑπόρχημα	θρήνος		
	ἐπικήδειον		

Before looking at his discussion of the *παίαν* itself, it will be helpful to begin with what Proclus has to say about *νόμος*, which for him is the principal genre associated with Apollo and the foil for the Dionysiac dithyramb. The important passage is *Chrestomathia*, 320^b21 ff.:

ἔοικε δὲ ὁ μὲν διθύραμβος ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς ἀγροὺς παιδιᾶς καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς πότοις εὐφροσύνης εὐρεθῆναι· ὁ δὲ νόμος δοκεῖ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ παιάνος ῥυθῆναι (ὁ μὲν γάρ ἐστι κοινότερος, εἰς κακῶν παραίτησιν γεγραμμένος, ὁ δὲ ἰδίως εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα)· ὅθεν τὸ μὲν ἐνθουσιῶδες οὐκ ἔχει, ὡς ὁ διθύραμβος. ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ μέθαι καὶ παιδιαί, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἰκετεῖαι καὶ πολλὴ τάξις . . .

(The dithyramb seems to have originated in country games and from the joy of drinking, whereas the *νόμος* is a derivative of the paeon. [*The latter is more general, being composed for the aversion of evils, whereas the former is in honour of Apollo.*] Hence [the *νόμος*] does not have the inspiration of the dithyramb. In the latter case, there is drunkenness and games, in the former prayers and a high degree of order . . .)

There are echoes here of Aristotle's reconstruction of the early development of tragedy and comedy from genres of choral lyric (*Poetics*, ch. 4); the same model had been recalled at 320^b5 ff., where Terpander was said to have 'perfected' the genre (the verb is *τελειόω*). And notice that Proclus seems to suggest that *νόμος* and *διθύραμβος*

³¹ Date: Hillgruber (1990); R. Beutler, *RE* xlv. 207–8. Didymus: M. Schmidt (1854), 390 ff.; Pfeiffer (1968), 184; Wilamowitz (1922), 108; Färber (1936), i. 19. See the parallel documented in n. 39.

represent serious and comic poetry, like tragedy and comedy in the *Poetics*. Earlier on, Proclus had said that the νόμος had started off choral, but had been transformed into a solo form by Chrysothemis of Crete (320^b 1 ff.).³²

In Proclean eidography, then, νόμος was not much different from the παιάν, and one might wonder whether confusion might have occurred between them. A special concern would be that some of the songs classified as *Paianes* in the Hellenistic edition of Pindar were really *Nomoi*. To understand why this is improbable, we have to look briefly at the sense of νόμος. The basic reference of the term is to a tune or melodic pattern, performed by a soloist. Some forms had no words but only music (they were called auletic or citharistic depending on the instrument; the Πυθικός Νόμος of Sacadas mentioned earlier was an example of the former); while others were accompanied by words (the citharodic, linked with the name of Terpander, and the aulodic). In the classical period the dominant form was the citharodic νόμος, a celebrated lyric genre at Athens, of which a single example is partly preserved in the *Persai* of Timotheus (*PMG* 791).³³

The main difference between παιάν and νόμος is not so much that the νόμος was usually solo (some of the *Paianes* might be also), but rather that the structure of the classical νόμος was different from that of choral lyric: some of them had a sequence of divisions unlike anything we find in triadic choral lyric, and the citharodic form popular in Athens seems to have been astrophic.³⁴ Furthermore, Proclus greatly exaggerates the Apolline quality of the νόμος. Although as god of music Apollo was seen as having invented a range of νόμοι, and although some νόμοι were specially associated with Delphi, on the whole the earlier forms show no unique link with

³² Choral performance of the νόμος is also attested in Clem. *Str.* 1. 133 (ii. 66. 18–19 Dindorf) (of Timotheus, possibly erroneous). Chrysothemis is linked with the Delphic Seperion in hyp. Pind. *Pyth.*, Dr ii. 4. 10; mentioned also at Paus. 10. 7. 2. Early Delphic παιάνες or νόμοι were supposed to have been composed by Philammon (see p. 27).

³³ Sources for the νόμος are collected in Färber (1936), i. 33, ii. 37; Wilamowitz (1903), 84 ff.; Smyth (1900), lviii ff.; W. Vetter, *RE* xxxiii. 840 ff.; Herington (1985), 19; Nagy (1990), 87 ff.; West (1992), 215 ff. It is included in the canon of lyric genres at Plato, *Laws* 700 b.

³⁴ Astrophic: ps.-Arist. *Probl.* 918^b 13; Heph. *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, 3. 5 (65. 1 Cons). Sections: Pollux 4. 66 distinguishes seven sections of the citharodic νόμος: ἀρχά, μεταρχά, κατατροπά, μετακατατροπά, ὄμφαλος, σφραγίς, ἐπίλογος. So the Πυθικός Νόμος had a series of sections imitating stages of the fight between Apollo and Python.

Apollo. Nor does the *Persai* of Timotheus provide evidence that the νόμος was a specially Apolline form of poetry, although Apollo has a prominent role in the final σφραγίς section, where he is invoked to assist the singer's performance (202 ff.) and to protect the city where the poem was performed (237 ff.).³⁵

Proclus' innovation (or that of his source) is in fact two-pronged: he not only makes the νόμος into the quintessentially Apolline genre, but he dissociates the παιάν from Apollo, so that it is the νόμος rather than the παιάν which is the foil of the Dionysiac διθύραμβος (contrast Plutarch's antithesis between παιάν and διθύραμβος: above, p. 82). Why should the substitution have been made? A number of factors probably contributed. The παιάν was perceived as so diverse that it was no longer felt to be a worthy symbol of Apollo. The παιάν may also have been perceived as artistically archaic and crude, as compared with the more perfect artistry of the kitharodic νόμος. Again, the name νόμος suggests the principle of order that Apollo is supposed to stand for. And finally, the solo νόμος was felt to be an appropriate symbol for Apollo, who already in Plutarch's theology is a token of unity.

We seem to catch an echo here of an intellectual dispute about which is the true Apolline genre. This dispute may well be much earlier than Proclus. The idea of the νόμος being derived from the παιάν, together with the idea that Terpander perfected it, sounds like Peripatetic genre theory. The scope of the παιάν—whether it was strictly confined to Apollo or broader—was already an issue in the fourth century BC, and certainly by the time of Hermippus. The idea of νόμος and διθύραμβος as two important lyric genres seems to suit Athens of the late fifth century BC. The only element that is not attested for the Hellenistic period is the Apolline value of the νόμος itself. But if the παιάν had lost its status as Apollo's genre *par excellence*, then it would be natural to look round for a substitute.³⁶

I move back now to Proclus' account of the παιάν (no. 3 above) at *Chrestomathia*, 320^a21 ff. This too he places in the εἰς θεούς category; contrast the generic theory represented by Servius, according to

³⁵ Apollo establishes νόμοι: *EM* 607. 1 = Färber (1936), ii. 39. νόμοι at Delphi: Sacadas, ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134 A; Philammon, ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1132 A; 1133 A-B; Apollo and νόμοι are also linked at Pind. *Nem.* 5. 35. The circumstances of performance of the *Persai* are discussed by Janssen (1984), 20-1.

³⁶ For Hermippus see p. 94. Plutarch's contrast between παιάν and διθύραμβος would thus be comparatively conservative; perhaps Plutarch was constrained by the context of Delphi, where παιάν and διθύραμβος do indeed alternate.

which the *παιάν* contained the praises of gods and men, i.e. belonged to the *εἰς θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους* category. Servius' account seems to make the *παιάν* into a sort of intermediate category half way between *ὕμνος* and *ἐγκώμιον*. Servius says that this pattern was followed by Pindar (F11), but it is more reminiscent of Hellenistic practice.

Proclus' account of the *παιάν* can be broken down into four clauses:

(1) ὁ δὲ παιάν ἐστιν εἶδος ᾠδῆς εἰς πάντας νῦν γραφόμενος θεοῦς, (2) τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν ἰδίως ἀπενέμετο τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, (3) ἐπὶ καταπαύσει λοιμῶν καὶ νόσων ᾄδόμενος. (4) καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰ προσόδια τινες παιᾶνας λέγουσιν.
 ([1] The *παιάν* is a form of song now written in honour of all deities, [2] whereas in ancient times it was dedicated to Apollo and Artemis exclusively, [3] being sung to stop plagues and diseases. [4] But now some apply the term *παιᾶνες* to *προσόδια*, misusing the word.)

Proclus distinguishes three interpretations of the *παιάν*: clauses (1) and (2) contrast a broader modern scope (written in honour of all deities) and a narrower ancient scope (dedicated to Apollo). It might seem strange that he wants to eliminate the Apolline element, but one finds clarification in his account of the *νόμος*, which for Proclus has usurped the place of the truly Apolline genre (*Chrest.* 320^b21-8).³⁷ Clause (3) might seem to go with (2), but in fact we can see from his account of the *νόμος* (320^b25) that the apotropaic function of the *παιάν* must be part of its contemporary form; in fact its apotropaic function would seem to be the defining feature of the genre for Proclus. He is presumably thinking of *παιᾶνες* to Asclepius, Sarapis, and other healing deities.

The third interpretation is articulated in clause (4): some people apply the term *παιᾶνες* to *προσόδια* by mistake (*καταχρηστικῶς*).³⁸ Since *προσόδια* for Proclus are cult songs performed in procession,³⁹ this statement might be thought to imply that for him the mode of performance appropriate for *παιᾶνες* is not procession but

³⁷ Apollo's role is played down in favour of the apotropaic function in a few other later sources, perhaps derivative from Proclus, e.g. several Σ on Hom. *Il.* 1. 473. (Eidographic sources are conveniently collected in Färber (1936), ii. 31-3).

³⁸ Contrast Servius' statement (=F11) that the term *παιάν* properly applies to Apollo and Artemis but is mistakenly (*abusively*) applied to other addressees.

³⁹ Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a17 ff. contrasts the *προσόδιον* with the *ὕμνος*, which is performed by a stationary *χορός* (ἐλέγετο δὲ τὸ *προσόδιον* ἐπειδὴν *προσιῶσι τοῖς βωμοῖς ἢ ναοῖς, καὶ ἐν τῷ προσιέναι ᾗδετο πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ κυρίως ὕμνος πρὸς κιθάραν ᾗδετο ἐστώτων* ('A poem was called a *προσόδιον* when they approached the altars or temples, and during the procession there was singing to the *αὐλός*; a *ὕμνος* in the strict sense was sung to the *κιθάρα* by people standing still'). The same contrast is attributed to

something else—presumably standing, less likely dancing. A similar distinction may be presupposed by the title of Limenios' song, in which a παιάν to Apollo and a προσόδιον to the same deity are assumed to be distinct. However, Proclus never says that παιᾶνες have to be performed in any particular way; what he does say is that they are apotropaic, so it seems more likely that the distinction between προσόδιον and παιάν is the apotropaic function of the latter. This would allow the possibility that παιᾶνες might be performed in procession.

We may compare the articulation of the borderline between *Paian* and *Prosodion* that operates in the Hellenistic edition of Pindar. At least some of the songs classed as *Paianes* there show signs of processional performance (e.g. D2); on the other hand, what differentiated the *Paianes* was not apotropaic function (which most of them lack), but probably some combination of formal and thematic features. Thus, in the case of the third triad of D6, which for some reason circulated as an independent song, and was classed as a *Prosodion* in the Hellenistic edition, isolated formal features that point towards a *Paian* (lines 127, 182) did not compensate for the absence of an explicitly Apolline performance context. The complex term προσοδιακὸς παιάν, used in a scholion on *Isthmian* 1 in reference to a Pindaric *Paian*, perhaps D4, may connote either a *Paian* believed to be performed in procession, or perhaps a more subtle generic hybrid somewhere on the borderline between *Paian* and *Prosodion*.⁴⁰

The more general question is to what extent the παιάν and προσόδιον were distinct in the fifth century BC. In practice, they could overlap: any παιάν performed in procession could be called by the more general term προσόδιον, and this is no small ambiguity, since many παιᾶνες, perhaps most, were performed in procession. However, the categories remain conceptually distinct in two ways: first, the two terms refer to non-intersecting aspects of classification (the central concept in the idea of the παιάν inheres in function backed

Didymus in *EM* 690. 35 = 4. 9. 4, 390 Schmidt. At *EM* 690. 41 = Färber (1936), ii. 14–15) προσόδια, ὑπορχήματα, and στάσιμα are three forms of ὕμνος (this being the broader use of ὕμνος mentioned earlier).

⁴⁰ Dr iii. 197. 1; cf. the title of D7 as restored by D'Alessio (1988b); Demochares in Athen. 253 B–C (*FGrH* 75 F 2) mentions προσοδιακοὶ χοροί ('processional χοροί'). Contrast the distinction in the inscription to Limenios' song, *CA* 149 (p. 34), where the two terms in the title παιάν and προσόδιον probably denote two sections of the same song, distinguished by metre.

up by certain key formal markers, whereas the central concept in the idea of the *προσόδιον* relates to manner of performance). Second, the *προσόδιον* is a more general category: to call a song a *προσόδιον* is to make a general statement about it, whereas to claim that it is a *παιάν* is much more specific.

To recapitulate, most cases of eidographic indeterminacy arose because Hellenistic classifiers tended to neglect the performance scenario of songs in favour of formal features, and to the extent that they were concerned with performance, they may sometimes have misinterpreted it. Bacchylides' *Ode* 17 belongs here; so may the problem described in *POxy* 2368, as may the uncertainties about the songs of Xenocritus and Xenodamus. The problems with the classification of Aristotle's song are in part analogous. Eidographic indeterminacy occasioned by doubt about performance context or occasion was probably comparatively rare, because the texts are generally forthcoming about the circumstances of their initial performance. In any case, this sort of eidographic indeterminacy is not a problem for the hypothesis that the lyric genres were fully distinct in the fifth century BC.

Nevertheless, it seems likely that in the generic system of the classical period not all demarcations between genres were clean. For example, we have seen that Hellenistic eidographers attempted to distinguish the *παιάν* and the *προσόδιον*, whereas in the classical period it seems likely that their applications overlapped in many cases. And the line of demarcation between *παιάν* and *ὑπόρχημα* may have been similarly blurred. So one of the sources of eidographical indeterminacy seems to be a limited generic indeterminacy, an untidiness in the deployment of names for genres, and a possibility of describing the same song in alternative ways, that goes back to the fifth century BC.

Finally, it may be that this indeterminacy is partly to be explained by the hypothesis of the poets' transgression and contamination of canonical models. Aristotle's Hermias-song has been thought to represent this sort of innovative practice, but even in the classical period poets may have experimented in this way, as tragedians were doing at the same time (see §10).

To return to the broader issue, does the existence of such overlaps jeopardize the whole idea that the *παιάν* was a distinct genre in the fifth century BC? The answer is surely 'no'. As far as the first factor

is concerned (textual evidence), although there are some problem cases, I have no doubt that in many cases the text of a song provides enough information for us to be sure that it was a *παῖάν*; and as for the second factor (overlapping), the solution here is to adopt an explanatory framework which allows for the fact that lyric genres were not always fully distinct in the fifth century BC. Overlapping is attested only between a few pairs of genres; between other pairs it probably did not occur: there is no attested instance of overlap between *παῖάν* and *θρῆνος*, although contemporaneous experiments in this direction are attested in Attic tragedy (see §§10–11); nor is there any attestation of contamination between *παῖάν* and the Dionysiac *διθύραμβος*, at least not until Philodamus' *παῖάν* of 338 BC (see §12). Those overlaps that do occur come about because the various genres of choral lyric are not all on the same level, but rather some are defined in terms of type of performance, others in terms of function, while some are more general and others more specific, so that categories intersect and the possibility of alternative descriptions arises. (Thus, many songs can be called *παῖάνες* or *προσόδια*.) Finally, as for the third factor (poetic licence), a small degree of licence in the use of genres would have to be set against a more general adherence to established models. Certainly, these factors are qualifications to the distinctiveness of the *παῖάν*, but their force is limited. All in all, the hypothesis that the *παῖάν* was a reasonably distinctive category in the fifth century BC is not seriously compromised.

10. ALLUSIONS TO THE *ΠΑΙΩΝ* IN ATTIC TRAGEDY

In the previous sections I have argued that for Greeks of the fifth century BC the *παῖάν* was a relatively discrete and unified concept. Effective as this defence is, however, in the last analysis it must be admitted that a certain ambivalence of scope and significance remains. To borderline phenomena of this sort the final three sections of this introduction are dedicated. I begin here with a discussion of allusions to the *παῖάν* in Greek tragedy; in §11 I turn to a complex phenomenon relating to the portrayal of the *παῖάν* in literature which I call 'paeanic ambiguity'; then in §12 I consider extensions of the genre in independent songs.

Attic tragedians refer frequently to the *παῖάν*, and sometimes use it as a model for choral odes, thus including allusions to an Apolline genre within a Dionysiac one—a potential source of a

generic discord.¹ The relationship between a choral ode in tragedy and the traditional model of the *παῖάν* is usually fairly loose—it is a matter of adaptation or extension of the existing model or even just allusion to it. To articulate the relation between dramatic and non-dramatic choral odes, we badly need methodological tools, and in the following pages I shall outline five: generic allusions and signatures; framing; generic deformation or extension; generic mixture and mutation; and choral projection.²

(a) *Allusions and signatures*

Some odes contain formal clues that suggest paeanicity. The *πάροδος* of the *OT* (151 ff.) purports to be an apotropaic prayer to avert a plague, so that it can be considered a *παῖάν* in virtue of its function. Although it lacks the refrain that would be expected in a *παῖάν*, it has two telling allusions to the genre. The first is a quasi-refrain in the first strophe (154): *ἡΐε Δάλιε Παῖάν* ('*ieie* Delian Paian'); the second is a generic signature in the second antistrophe (185): *παιῶν δὲ λάμπει στονόεσσά τε γῆρυς ὄμαυλος* ('the *παῖάν* flashes, and the mournful cry in concert'), which seems to refer to apotropaic utterances of the Apolline cry *ie paian*, mixed with outbursts of mourning. This ode is unusual because it is such a close approximation to a *παῖάν*.³

Another Sophoclean text suggestive of the *παῖάν* is *Philoctetes*, 827 ff. The *χορός* appeal to Sleep to come and help the tortured Philoctetes:

"Υπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαῆς, Ὑπνε δ' ἀλγέων
εὐαῆς ἡμῖν ἔλθοις, εὐαίων,
830 εὐαίων, ὦναξ· ὄμμασι δ' ἀντίσχοις
τάνδ' αἶγλαν, ἃ τέταται τανῦν.
ἴθι ἴθι μοι, Παῖῶν

(Sleep, unversed in pain, unversed in anguish, may you come to us blowing fair, you of the good life, good life, lord. May you continue to hold up to

¹ I have discussed the implications of inclusion of the Apolline in a Dionysiac environment and related issues in Rutherford (1995a).

² In general see Webster (1970); Kranz (1933); Dale (1950), who argues against the idea that choral odes in tragedy fall into the same series of genres as extra-dramatic odes.

³ See pp. 36–7. Contrast the third stasimon of the *OT* (1086 ff.), in which the *χορός* speculate excitedly on the parentage of Oedipus; that this ode is meant to be a *παῖάν* is suggested by the exclamation in line 1096: *ἡΐε Φοῖβε, σοὶ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέστω* ('*ieie* Phoebus. May these things be pleasing to you'). Its excited quality is similar to that of *Tra.* 215 ff., on which see below.

his eyes this light of healing, which now extends before him. Come, come to me, Healer.)

Paeanic features pointed to by commentators are the epithet *εὐαίων* and the noun *αἴγλαν* (the latter has a special association with the cult of Asclepius).⁴ Sophocles creates a realistic impression of a cult *παιάν*. (Sleep may even have been a joint dedicatee of some real *παιάνες*, to judge from a late Attic inscription dedicated to Asclepius, Hugiēia, and Hupnos: *IG* ii/2. 4533.) However, the expectation that this ode creates is false (like that of so many paeanic odes in tragedy); it is in fact a decoy. Immediately Philoctetes is asleep, the *χορός* advise Neoptolemus to steal the bow (833–8) (so Sleep was an instrument of deception in the Homeric *Διὸς Ἀπάτη*). In a dactylic interlude, Neoptolemus objects that the oracle required the presence of Philoctetes also, but in the antistrophe and epode the *χορός* insist that he should take the bow.⁵

Generic signature can also be by allusion. The *πάροδος* of the *Antigone* (100 ff.) is an ode of victory, and could be thought of as a victory *παιάν*, though no formal features corroborate this. It starts with an invocation to a ray of the sun (*ἄκτις ἀελίου*), which is described following the Argive army as they flee. An interesting feature of this is that the opening words seem to be a citation of Pindar's *Paian* which commemorated an eclipse of the sun (A1) composed for performance at the Ismenion at Thebes, perhaps in 467 BC, so presumably some time before the *Antigone*.⁶

(b) *Framing*

It is possible to set up a choral song as a *παιάν* with a frame. For example, early in Aeschylus' *Septem* Eteocles asks the *χορός* of girls to utter a sacrificial cry in reply to his prayer (267 ff.). The unique phraseology combines the female *δολοιυγή* with the *παιάν*-cry which we usually associate with men.⁷ Given that he goes on to talk about making a sacrifice, the natural interpretation is that the *δολοιυγή* and the *ἰὴ παιάν* are sacrificial cries. However, the choral ode that follows after a few lines (287 ff.) can be seen as an expansion of the reply,

⁴ *εὐαίων*: p. 76. *αἴγλαν*: §7 n. 28. Poetics of the *παιάν*: Watkins (1995), 514–15, to whom I am also indebted for the translation. Sleep is also a theme in Bacch. fr. 4 (*Paian*), 77 ff.

⁵ Winnington-Ingram (1980), 287; Segal (1977b), 146; on the allusion to the *Διὸς Ἀπάτη* see Haldane (1963), 54; D. M. Jones (1949); Burton (1980), 242.

⁶ See pp. 193, 199–200.

⁷ I cite these lines on p. 48.

and so a *παῖάν*-song.⁸ This pattern suggests the antiphonal mode of performance attested in the *παῖάν* outside drama.

In the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* Iphigeneia calls on the female *χορός* to sing a *παῖάν* as she is sacrificed, a peculiar inversion of the sacrificial *παῖάν* (1474 ff.). This introduction is followed by an unusual sort of lyric dialogue in aeolo-choriambic metre: Iphigeneia sings a monody (1475 ff.) in which she repeats her resolve to endure sacrifice, and calls on the *χορός* to dance around the temple and the altar of Artemis, and to reply (1492 *συνεπαείδετε*). After a few exchanges, the *χορός* reply with an ode in honour of Artemis which echoes Iphigeneia's monody at many points (1510).⁹

(c) *Generic deformation or extension*

Some choral odes in tragedy are like *παῖάνες* in some respects, but unlike them in others. Thus, they can be thought of as representing a deformation or extension of the basic generic model. For example, in the real world *παῖάνες* were specially associated with men and rarely, if ever, performed by women. However, in tragedy the *παῖάν* is quite often associated with women. We have already seen an example of this in the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. In the *Choephoroi* Electra instructs the *χορός* to sing a *παῖάν* over the tomb of Agamemnon. In the *Trakhiniai* the female *χορός* anticipate the return of Heracles with an excited ode which is at least in part a *παῖάν* (see (d)). The same variation is implied at *Agamemnon*, 99, where the *χορός* call on the manly Clytemnestra to become the 'healer' (*παίων*) of their anxiety.

A second example of an exceptional mode of performance is Ion's solo *παῖάν* in Euripides' *Ion*, 82 ff. A strophe and antistrophe each conclude with a spondaic refrain, contrasting with the aeolo-choriambic of the earlier part (lines 125-7 = 141-3):

ὦ Παῖαν ὦ Παῖάν,
εὐαίων εὐαίων
εἴης, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ.

(O Paian, O Paian, may you be fortunate, fortunate, O son of Leto.)

This is the only true *παῖάν*-refrain in extant tragedy.¹⁰ The strophe is

⁸ A second case, slightly more complex, is *Cho.* 152 ff. (see pp. 119-20).

⁹ The choral response to Iphigeneia's ode has sometimes been regarded as part of the interpolated final scene of the play (similarities to Iphigeneia's ode can be neatly accounted for as imitations), but it is accepted as genuine by Günther (1988).

¹⁰ Barner (1971), 294, 298, puts the refrain in context.

a cheerful description of the branch of laurel with which Ion sweeps the temple (one is reminded, perhaps, of the laurel-bearing ritual in the Delphic Septerion, which would have been accompanied by the singing of παιᾶνες).¹¹ Most of the antistrophe is a celebration of Ion's sacred work (128 ff.):

καλὸν γε τὸν πόνον, ὦ
 Φοῖβε, σοὶ πρὸ δόμων λατρεύ-
 ω, τιμῶν μαντεῖον ἔδραν,
 κλεινὸς δ' ὁ πόνος μοι
 θεοῖσιν δούλαν χέρ' ἔχειν,
 οὐ θνατοῖς ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοισ·
 εὐφάμους δὲ πόνους
 μοχθεῖν οὐκ ἀποκάμνω.

(O Phoebus, fair is the labour that I perform for you before your house, honouring the prophetic seat, and glorious for me is the labour of holding a servile hand for the gods—not mortals but immortals. I do not tire of performing labours of good repute.)

The theme of 'sacred labour' can be paralleled in non-dramatic παιᾶνες.¹² What is unusual is the solo performance, even more striking since the χορός, who represent Athenian women accompanying Creusa to Delphi, sing nothing resembling a παιάν. There is an echo of Ion's solo παιάν later on in the play in Creusa's monody, where she laments the son she believes has been lost while Apollo indulges himself in self-laudatory παιάν-singing:

καὶ νῦν ἔρρει
 πτανοῖς ἀρπασθεῖς θοῖνα
 παῖς οὐμὸς καὶ σὸς τλάμων,
 σὺ δὲ κιθάρα κλάζεις
 παιᾶνας μέλπων.

(And now he is gone, a meal seized by birds, my unhappy child and yours, but you screech on the κιθάρα, chanting παιᾶνες.)

Both Apollo's παιάν and Ion's seem to symbolize alienation of a male figure from communal obligations. This perversion of the normal role of the παιάν as an image of social cohesion can be interpreted as part of a more general negative portrayal of Apollo in this play.

¹¹ See pp. 201–2.

¹² See p. 249.

(d) Generic mixture

This is a special case of (c). In the *Laus* Plato castigates modern poets for transgressing inherited generic models, e.g. mixing dirges with hymns and παιᾶνες with διθύραμβοι (700 D):

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου ἄρχοντες μὲν τῆς ἀμούσου παρανομίας ποιηταὶ ἐγίνοντο φύσει μὲν ποιητικοί, ἀγνώμονες δὲ περὶ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς Μούσης καὶ τὸ νόμιμον, βακχεύοντες καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ δέοντος κατεχόμενοι ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, κεραννύντες δὲ θρήνους τε ὕμνοις καὶ παιᾶνας διθυράμβοις . . .

(After this with the passage of time control over Muse-less illegality passed to the poets, who were poetic by nature, but ignorant of the justice of the Muse and her law, indulging in Bacchic revelry and possessed by pleasure more than is right, mixing θρήνοι with ὕμνοι and παιᾶνες with διθύραμβοι . . .)

It seems likely that Plato is thinking principally of Athenian state theatre here, in view of his general hostility to this genre.¹³

A good example here is the celebratory ode in Sophocles' *Trakhiiniai* (205 ff.). The χορός celebrate with an ecstatic ode the news that Heracles is on his way home. Two generic allusions point to the παιάν: the quasi-refrain in line 220 (ὡ ὡ Παιάν) and the generic signature or quasi-refrain in lines 210–11 (ὁμοῦ δὲ παιᾶνα παιᾶν ἀναίρετ', ὦ παρθέναι: 'together raise the παιάν, O maidens'). But only the first half of the song is about Apollo. The second is about Dionysus: the χορός shout the Dionysiac cry εὐοὶ (219) and talk about the ivy twisting a Bacchic contest (219–20) (ἰδοῦ μ' ἀναταράσσει . . . ὁ κισσὸς ἄρτι Βακχίαν | ὑποστρέφων ἄμιλλαν), which suggests the διθύραμβος (the ivy is the inspiration, standing for Dionysus, but it also symbolizes the circular dance itself). The ode is a generic mixture, and in fact it is a mutation in so far as the paeanic section is earlier and the dithyrambic later.¹⁴ The transition to Dionysus represents an odd crossing of genres, since one would naturally associate Dionysus with the διθύραμβος.¹⁵

¹³ Nagy (1979), 108–9, 401.

¹⁴ ὑπόρρημα: Burton (1980), 50, following ΣSoph. *Tra.* 216 (=Elmsley (1825), 157. 1) τὸ γὰρ μελιδάριον οὐκ ἔστι στάσιμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς ὀρχοῦνται ('The song is not a stasimon, but rather they dance out of joy'). ὁλολυγμός: Easterling (1982), 104, says: 'the implication of D(eianeira)'s instructions at 202 ff. and of ἀνολολυξάτω at 205 is that the song is to be an ὁλολυγμός'. διθύραμβος: Vox (1984), whose general thesis is that διθύραμβοι are essentially songs of triumph (cf. Cairns (1972), 95–7; Hardie (1976), who wisely suggests that this association may not predate Hor. *Odes*, 1. 37).

¹⁵ The 'generic syncretism' implied here points forward to the παιάν of Philodamus of Scarpheia, discussed at pp. 131–5.

Another form of generic extension to which the *παῖάν* is subject involves the interface with the chthonic; *παῖᾶνες* are sometimes used with a chthonic force which they probably did not possess in the 'real world' (see further pp. 118–20).

(e) *Choral projection*

Sometimes a *χορός* describe another choral performance, which seems to be an indirect description of themselves. Albert Henrichs analyses such patterns as projections by the *χορός* of their own performance on to an imaginary one, suggesting the term 'choral projection'.¹⁶ The second stasimon of Euripides' *Heracles* is a joyful ode occasioned by the return of Heracles (687 ff.). This has been analysed as an *ἐγκώμιον* (in the sense of a song of praise in honour of a mortal) by H. Parry.¹⁷ A brief analysis of its structure will be useful: in the first strophe the *χορός* of old men express the wish that they might enjoy a second youth; in the first antistrophe they suggest that the gods should arrange that the virtuous should live twice; in the second strophe they talk about their role as singers of Heracles' praises; finally, in the second antistrophe they compare themselves to *παῖάν*-singing Delian maidens and announce that they are themselves singing *παῖᾶνες* (687 ff.):

παῖᾶνα μὲν Δηλιάδες
 (ναῶν) ὑμνεύς' ἀμφὶ πύλας
 τὸν Λατοῦς εὐπαιδα γόνον
 690 εἰλίσσουσαι καλλίχοροι·
 παῖᾶνας δ' ἐπὶ σοῖς μελάρθοις
 κύκνος ὥς γέρων ἀοιδὸς
 πολιᾶν ἐκ γενύων
 κελαδήσω· τὸ γὰρ εὖ
 695 τοῖς ὕμνοισιν ὑπάρχει·
 Διὸς ὁ παῖς.

(The Delian maidens sing the paean around the gates of the temples, in honour of the excellent child of Leto, whirling in fair dance. So at your doors I shall sing paeans like an old swan from my grey jaw. For the theme of my song is excellence—he is the child of Zeus.)

Here the dominant sense of *παῖᾶνα/παῖᾶνας* is hymn(s) in praise of Apollo/a god, and it is implied that Heracles is as worthy of having

¹⁶ Henrichs (1995).

¹⁷ Parry (1965); and now Hose (1990), ii. 37 ff.; on the *ἐγκώμιον* see Harvey (1955), 163–4.

παῖνες addressed to him as Apollo is (that status is suggested by the words *Διὸς ὁ παῖς* in line 696). This description contrasts with the earlier stanzas, which concentrate on the mortality both of the singers and of Heracles; it also points forward to Heracles' eventual ascension to Olympus.¹⁸ Like some of the other choral odes we have considered, this is a joyful ode that precedes a disaster. The second stasimon of the *Heracles* is immediately followed by the short scene between Amphitryon and Lycus, then the third stasimon, another joyful ode, after which comes a sudden reversal with the appearance of Iris and Lyssa.¹⁹ Perhaps Euripides meant a sense of foreboding to be triggered by the reflection that in comparing themselves to the Deliades the *χοροί* imply that they are treating Heracles like a god, which, despite Heracles' unusual position between the divine and mortal spheres, may have appeared impious and hybriatic.²⁰

I I. PAEANIC AMBIGUITY

Representations of the *παῖαν* in Greek literature are very often characterized by ambiguity.¹ The most efficient way of approaching this subject, it seems to me, is to think in terms of a range of categories: (a) paeanic ambiguity on the battlefield; (b) ambiguity between different types of *παῖαν*; (c) linkage between the *παῖαν* and the chthonic sphere in Greek tragedy; (d) ambiguity between *παῖαν* 'song' and *παῖαν* 'healer'; (e) paeanic ambiguity expressing the duplicitous nature of Apollo; and (f) the celebratory *παῖαν* preceding

¹⁸ For the ambiguous position of Heracles between gods and men see *Her.* 2. 44 (Heracles on Thasos); with Bergquist (1973); Silk (1985).

¹⁹ Other instances of celebration preceding disaster are discussed on pp. 123–6. Note that at *HF* 815 ff., where the *χοροί* cry out in terror—*ἔα ἔα | ἄρ' ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν πίτυλον ἤκομεν φόβου, | γέροντες, οἶον φάσμι' ὑπὲρ δόμων ὄρω; | φυγῇ φυγῇ | νωθὲς πέδαιρε κῶλον, ἐκποδὼν ἔλα. | ὤναξ Παιάν, | ἀπότροπος γένοίό μοι πημάτων* ('Ah, ah! Do we come to the same rhythm of fear, old men, because of the vision I see above the house? In flight raise your slow leg, draw it out of the way. Lord Paian, become an averter for me of my troubles!')—the appeal to Paian seems to recall the *παῖνες* mentioned in the last stanza of the second stasimon.

²⁰ Irrelevant to this passage would seem to be (1) the fact that *παῖνες* were sung to heroes in the 5th cent. BC (some Pindaric fragments involving Heracles—S1, perhaps S7—could come from *παῖνες*, but I doubt it); and (2) the Hellenistic practice of singing *παῖνες* to reigning potentates. The *παῖαν* to Heracles mentioned by Stat. *Theb.* 4. 157 may imitate this passage; and Aelius Aristides' *παῖαν* to Heracles Aesclepius (p. 136) seems late and eccentric.

¹ 'Paianic ambiguity' has rarely been noticed, though see the observations of Dale (1954) and Seaford (1984); also Foley (1985), 76, apropos of Eur. *IA* 1467 ff. Rutherford (1993) is an earlier version of this section.

'tragic' reversal. In almost all of these—the exception is (d)—some contribution to the effect of ambiguity is made by the wide range of contexts in which *παιᾶνες* were performed, ranging from the joy of victory to the anxiety of impending disaster.

(a) *Paeanic ambiguity on the battlefield*

Greeks seem to have been aware that *παιᾶνες* performed on the battlefield might be misunderstood. For example, in an anecdote told by Thucydides the Athenian army is confused by the battle-*παιάν* of their Dorian allies, which is almost indistinguishable from that of their Dorian enemies. Ironically, in this case the singing of the *παιάν*, which, as Aeneas Tacticus confirms, was intended partly as a method of averting military panic, actually contributes to producing it. A misunderstanding of a different sort is anticipated by the messenger who speaks at Aesch. *Per.* 392–4:

οὐ γὰρ ὡς φυγῇ
παιᾶν ἐφύμνου σερμνὸν Ἑλλήνες τότε,
 ἀλλ' ἐς μάχην ὀρμῶντες εὐψύχῳ θράσει.

(For the Greeks then chanted the solemn paeon not for flight but starting towards battle with cheerful valour.)

Here the distinction is between a pre-battle *παιάν* and an apotropaic *παιάν* sung by an army in flight (a function of the *παιάν* that is not otherwise attested for the battlefield). A third illustration of paeanic ambiguity on the battlefield is a fortuitous misunderstanding which Herodotus narrates in his account of the conflict between the Paeonians and the Perinthians. The Paeonians had been warned by an oracle not to attack until they heard the name of their tribe called, and believed that the signal had come when the Perinthians sang a victory *παιάν* because some Perinthian animals had won a contest. On one level, the only point of the story is a lexical ambiguity (cf. the cases of ambiguity between *παιάν* 'song' and *παιάν* 'healer' discussed under (d) below). But there may be other levels of meaning here, because the story also carries the moral that if a victory *παιάν* is performed prematurely, its effect may be disastrous; in particular, it may be interpreted as a signal for battle (virtually a pre-battle *παιάν*) by the other side, and so lead to the initiation of a military conflict the outcome of which will be uncertain (cf. (f) below).²

² Thuc. 7. 44. 6; Aen. Tact. 27. 3; Her. 5. 1; mentioned on pp. 43–4.

(b) Ambiguity between different types of παιάν: Evidence from comedy

The survey of paeanic functions that I presented in the introduction (§§4 and 5) may have given the impression that every παιάν and every performance of a παιάν has one function only. However, many παιάνες can be interpreted as serving more than one function. Thus, Pindar, D2, seems to combine the functions of a cult παιάν and a παιάν commemorating a victory and/or anticipating renewed military conflict. Pindar, A1, seems to be intended for performance in cult, but the first triad, which contains a series of anxious questions about the consequences portended by a recent eclipse, has more in common with an apotropaic παιάν. Again, according to Xenophon, *Hell.* 4. 7. 4, Agesipolis and Spartans sang 'the παιάν concerning Poseidon' when an earthquake interrupted their meal, but this performance also presumably fulfilled the function of a συμπόσιον-παιάν (see p. 36). More generally, just as Plutarch reports that the ritual cry ἐλελεῦ, ἰού, ἰού uttered at the Athenian Oschophoria could be analysed as a combination of joy (ἐλελεῦ) and fear (ἰού, ἰού), so we should not be surprised if a combination of feelings are expressed at any ritual performance, and one could argue that the versatile παιάν is ideally suited as a vehicle for these.³

We would expect the Greeks to have been aware that there were different types of παιάν, and in fact this awareness is illustrated nicely by Aesch. *Per.* 392-4 (cited above), where the messenger distinguishes a pre-battle παιάν from an apotropaic παιάν uttered by an army in flight. I find other indications of such awareness in the exploitation of the ambiguity of the παιάν-cry as a source for humour in Greek comedy. Consider Aristophanes, *Peace*, 453-5:

Ἐρ. ἡμῖν δ' ἀγαθὰ γένοιντ'. ἢ Παιάν, ἢ.

Τρ. ἄφελε τὸ παίειν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον λέγε.

Ἐρ. ἢ ἢ τοῖνυν, ἢ μόνον λέγω.

(HERMES. But for us may there be blessings. Strike up the paean: *ie!* TRYGAEUS. Leave out the striking; just say *ie*. HERMES. All right, I simply say: *ie, ie, ie!*)

The point of the joke is that a celebratory παιάν-cry sounds like the unpleasant verb παίω,⁴ but perhaps the fact that the παιάν-cry

³ Plut. *Thes.* 22 τὸ μὲν σπεύδοντες ἀναφωνεῖν καὶ παιωνίζοντες εἰώθασιν, τὸ δὲ ἐκπλήξεως καὶ παραχῆς ἐστι ('The one they are accustomed to shout out in earnest and celebration, the other is a sign of terror and commotion').

⁴ Compare the later etymology from παίω referred to on p. 14.

can also express anxiety is in the background here. *Acharnians*, 1212–13, gives us roughly the reverse of this:

Λα. ἰὼ ἰὼ Παιάν Παιάν.

Δι. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ νυνὶ τήμερον Παιώνια.

(LAMACHUS. *Io io Paian Paian!* DICAEOPOLIS. But the Paionia festival is not today.)

Dicaeopolis pretends to misinterpret Lamachus' anxious *παιάν*-cry as a celebration of the Attic Paionia (probably a fictitious festival).⁵ This time, then, expression of fear is misunderstood as an expression of celebration. There may be a third example at Eur. *Cyc.* 663–4, where the blinded Cyclops cries out in pain and the *χορός* of satyrs comments: *καλὸς γ' ὁ παιάν· μέλπε μοι τόνδ' αὖ Κύκλωψ* ('The *παιάν* is fair. Sing it again, Cyclops'); the point of the joke is perhaps that for the *χορός* the Cyclops' apotropaic *παιάν* (i.e. his cry of pain) is not only 'fair' but actually amounts to a *παιάν* of celebration.⁶

(c) *Linkage between the παιάν and the chthonic sphere in Greek tragedy*

One of the most interesting forms of ambiguity shows itself in the *παιάν*'s relationship to the chthonic in tragedy. I suggested earlier that the semantics of the *παιάν* seem to have led to a clash of categories in this area: on the one hand, the connotations of jubilation that attach to the *παιάν* are prima facie diametrically opposed to the chthonic; on the other hand, in so far as the *παιάν* can be not only a general means of worship, but also an apotropaic prayer, it would be natural that *παιᾶνες* would be sung to chthonic deities and to heroes, and we have seen evidence for this (pp. 49–50). In Aeschylus—and in his imitator Euripides—we seem to see a tendency to refer to the *παιάν* in the context of death and the chthonic. The simplest case, perhaps, is the 'Death as Paian' topos, attested first in a fragment of Aeschylus' *Philoctetes*, where Philoctetes calls on death to relieve him of suffering (*TrGF* iii. 255):

ὦ θάνατε παιών, μή μ' ἀτιμάσης μολεῖν·
μόνος (γάρ) εἴ σὺ τῶν ἀνηκέστων κακῶν
ἱατρός, ἄλγος δ' οὐδὲν ἄπτεται νεκροῦ.

⁵ That the Paionia is fictitious was maintained by Deubner (1932), 202, with references cited in n. 7; Sommerstein (1980), 214.

⁶ See Seaford (1984), 220: 'the similarity between the exuberant cries of pain and joy allows the satyrs to call Pol(yphemus)' cry of pain a song of triumph for their own victory'.

(O healer death, do not deprive me of the honour of your coming; you alone can cure ills beyond healing, and no pain touches a corpse.)

This rich and resonant image works on several levels: for death to be a healer is a paradox, especially when what it heals is 'unhealable' (line 2). And I think that at least on the level of poetry there is an incongruity between the chthonic sphere and the word *παιών*, which is usually associated with the upper Apolline sphere. This passage was imitated by Euripides, who has the dying Hippolytus make a similar prayer (*Hipp.* 1373).

Conjunctions between *παιάν* and 'death' are often more complex. A good example is Aesch. *Cho.* 149–51, where Electra instructs the *χορός* to sing an antiphonal *παιάν* in response to her prayer:

τοιαῖσδ' ἐπ' εὐχαῖς τάσδ' ἐπισπένδω χοάς,
 ὑμᾶς δὲ κωκυτοῖς ἐπανθίζειν νόμος
 παιῶνα τοῦ θανόντος ἐξαιδωμένας.

(After such prayers I pour out these libations, and it is the custom for you to decorate them with the flowers of laments, uttering a paean to the dead man.)

To elucidate the sense of *παιῶνα τοῦ θανόντος* here we need to look at the short ode that the *χορός* sing immediately afterwards (152 ff. *ἴετε δάκρυ καναχῆς ὀλόμενον . . .*). This ode starts as a *θρήνος*, where the sincere tears of the mourners are pictured as combining with the abominable libations sent by Clytemnestra; it quickly changes to a prayer to Agamemnon, that someone should come to avenge his death. The discordant tone of the ode seems to be prepared for by the expression *παιῶνα τοῦ θανόντος*, which involves an apparent inconsistency between the Olympian *παιάν* and its chthonic context. One might resolve this inconsistency by taking the expression as a periphrasis for *θρήνος*. But 'prayer to the dead man' is also a possible interpretation (one recalls that *παιᾶνες* seem to have been sung to heroes in the fifth century BC). The positive tone of the final lines of the ode even suggests that by *παιῶνα τοῦ θανόντος* we are to understand a song that is precisely the opposite of a *θρήνος*, in other words a positive song, perhaps one of victory, anticipating the triumph of Electra and Orestes.⁷

⁷ Prayer to the dead man: Webster (1970), 127. Victory song: Garvie (1970), 81. So in the *κομμός* a few lines further on in that play (342–4) *ἀντί δὲ θρήνων ἐπιτυμβιδίων | παιῶν μελάνθοις ἐν βασιλείοις | νεοκράτα φίλον κομίσειεν* ('instead of *θρήνοι* by the tomb may the *παιάν* in the royal halls usher in the welcome newly mixed bowl of wine';

Similar cases of ambiguity are found in Euripides; the best example is perhaps the passage from the *Alcestis* (lines 422–4) in which, soon after the death of his wife, Admetus asks the χορός to sing a παιάν to Hades: ἀντηχήσατε | παιάνα τῷ κάτωθεν ἀσπώνδῳ θεῷ ('sing in response a παιάν to the implacable god below'). One might suppose that παιάνα is to be understood in the oxymoronic sense 'dirge', as elsewhere.⁸ Yet the ode that follows—the second stasimon—suggests not so much a mournful dirge but an encomium of Alcestis (recall the reference to παιάν-singing in honour of heroes at the Spartan Karneia).⁹ The quality of the ode is understandable, since a full-blown κομμός would have been out of place in the 'prosatyric' *Alcestis*, where death turns out to be a reversible transition. But did Euripides first set up the expectation that the χορός would sing a dirge (παιάνα . . . ἄσπονδον), only to flout it? I think rather that Admetus instructs the χορός to sing a παιάν in response to death (retaining the reading ἀσπώνδῳ).¹⁰ The direct confrontation between παιάν and death here reflects a more general antithesis between the forces of life and death, a major theme in the play, symbolized in the prologue by the encounter between Apollo and Thanatos, later on by the contrast between the mourning palace and the healthy appetite of Heracles and by the wrestling match between Heracles and Thanatos, and implied in the premiss that Apollo's presence at the court of Admetus is the result of a chain of action that began with his son Asclepius successfully bringing the dead back to life.¹¹

cf. Garvie (1986), 135) there is a clear reference to the συμπόσιον-παιάν (contrast Fairbanks (1900), 41). And at *Ag.* 644–5, where a messenger reports military defeat τοῖωνδε μέντοι πημάτων σεσαγμένον | πρέπει λέγειν παιάνα τόνδ' Ἐρινύων ('It is fitting that a man loaded with troubles of this sort should speak this paean of the Erinyes') παιάνα . . . Ἐρινύων could be either an apotropaic prayer sung to the Erinyes (perhaps amounting to a dirge) or a song of victory sung by the Erinyes. Haldane (1965) has an interesting discussion of the use of παιάν in inappropriate contexts in Aeschylus.

⁸ So Fairbanks (1900), 42; von Blumenthal (1943), 2348; implied also in Diggle's emendation of ἀσπώνδῳ to ἄσπονδον, since a libationless παιάν would be no παιάν at all.

⁹ See pp. 31–2.

¹⁰ This interpretation of ἀντηχήσατε was already suggested by Dale (1954), 86–7. On the ode see also Webster (1970), 145.

¹¹ This theme comes out well slightly earlier in the play in a short prayer made by the χορός to Apollo as Paian, and therefore perhaps to be considered a sort of παιάν in itself (lines 220 ff.): ὦναξ Παιάν | ἔξευρε μηχανήν τιν' Ἀδμήτῳ κακῶν. | πόριζε δὴ πόριζε· καὶ πάρος γάρ | †τοῦδ' ἐφεύρες†, καὶ νῦν | λυτήριος ἐκ θανάτου γενού, | φόνιον δ' ἀπόπαυσον Ήιδαν ('Lord Paian, find a solution to the troubles of Admetus. Supply it, supply it. For you did before. And now also become a saviour from death, and

(d) *Ambiguity between παιάν 'song' and παιάν 'Paian'/'healer'*

A discussion of forms of ambiguity involved in the representation of the παιάν would not be complete without registering ambiguity between παιάν 'song' and παιάν 'Paian'/'healer', though this is different in kind from the other forms of ambiguity mentioned in this section. This form of ambiguity may be very ancient if, as I suggested earlier (§2), the name of the genre arose by way of a transference from the 'Paian'/'healer' sense. Two elegant applications of this ambiguity in classical poetry are worth mentioning. The first is the refrain of Pindar, D2, where παιάν δὲ μήποτε λείποι could refer either to the continued support of Apollo or to the continued singing of the song (an appropriate thought in a refrain). The second case is line 184 of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* (from the parodos), where παιών δὲ λάμπει could describe either an epiphany of Apollo or the roar of the παιάν-cry, which could be said to 'flash' by synaesthesia.¹²

A lexical ambiguity of a different type that can be mentioned here is one that seems to be present in the expression ἀκτὰς ἀπαίωνας at Sophocles fr. 523, referring to the shores of Hades. Depending on how the epithet is analysed, it could mean either 'lacking παιᾶνες' or 'lacking life (αἰών)'.

(e) *Paeianic ambiguity expressing the duplicitous nature of Apollo*

The broad range of performance scenarios associated with παιᾶνες—ranging from war to peacetime festival, and expressing both anxiety and joy—makes it a suitable vehicle to express Apollo's own nature, which encompasses political order and music, but also destruction and war.¹³ There is an illustration of this in Timotheus, *Persae* (PMG 791), 196 ff., where the narrative ends with the victorious Greeks invoking Paian and dancing a celebratory dance, whereupon

stop deadly Hades'). In this apotropaic παιάν the χορός appeal to Apollo to stop (ἀπόπαυσον) death, possibly suggesting an etymological play on the word παιάν (see p. 14). One might contrast the situation presupposed in a fragment of Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 161 (*Niobe*), cited on pp. 49–50. In this tragedy death is a finality and Niobe will grieve for ever; there is no point in supplicating death. In the prosatyrlic *Alcestis* the situation is the reverse: death is not inevitable, Apollo is on hand; he deferred death for Admetus and he will arrange that Alcestis be restored to life. It follows that in the *Alcestis* a παιάν to death need not necessarily reduce to a dirge.

¹² For the synaesthetic interpretation see Segal (1977a), 89.

¹³ Double aspect of Apollo: Pfeiffer (1952) (apropos of Call. fr. 114, describing the Delian statue of Apollo which held the Kharites in the right hand and the bow in the left); Detienne (1986), 7 ff.

Timotheus invokes Paian for help in his song. In a sense, then, the transition by which the poet passes from narrative to *σφραγίς* is effected by a juxtaposition of two different types of *παιάν*—the battle-*παιάν* of the Greeks, symbolizing Apollo as god of war, and a *παιάν* for poetic inspiration, symbolizing Apollo as god of music.¹⁴ But the best illustration of this application of paeanic ambiguity may be a passage from Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (20–5), where Callimachus describes the reactions of Thetis and Niobe on hearing the *παιάν*:

οὐδὲ Θέτις Ἀχιλλῆα κινύρεται αἴλινα μήτηρ,
ὀππόθ' ἢ παιήον ἢ παιήον ἀκούσῃ.
καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,
ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,
μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς οἷζυρόν τι χανούσης.
ἢ ἢ φθέγγεσθε· κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν.

(Nor does Thetis his mother mourn—*ai Linos!*—for Achilles, when she hears *hie paieon*, *hie paieon*. And the tear-drenched rock defers its grief, the wet rock which is fixed in Phrygia, marble in place of a woman mouthing something mournful. Sing *hie*, *hie*. It is bad to fight the blessed ones.)

Callimachus plays on the traditional antithesis between the chthonic *θρήνος* and the Olympian *παιάν*, and suggests that the effect of the *παιάν* is so strong that it can even dispel the grief of Thetis or Niobe, whose children Apollo killed. And Callimachus no doubt intends there to be a special irony in view of the fact that the *παιάν* symbolizes Apollo's role as killer, since, as Callimachus explains later on in the *Hymn to Apollo*, the *παιάν*-cry is derived from the words 'Shoot, child' (ἔει, παῖ), which were shouted to the young Apollo when he killed the Delphic dragon.¹⁵

¹⁴ οἱ δὲ τροπαία στησάμενοι Διὸς | ἀγνότατον τέμενος, Παιάν' | ἐκελάδησαν ἱήϊον | ἄνακτα, σύμμετροι δ' ἔπε- | κτύπεον ποδῶν | ὑψικρότοις χορείαις. | ἀλλ' ὦ χρυσεοκίθαριν ἀέ- | ξιων μούσαν νεοτευχῇ, | ἐμοῖς ἔλθ' ἐπικούρος ὕμ- | νοις, ἡΐε Παιάν ('They, setting up trophies in the most holy sanctuary of Zeus, called on Lord Ieios Paian, and stamped the ground in time with high-beating dancing of feet. But, you who increase the new-made Muse with her golden lyre, come to the aid of my song, Ieios Paian!'). Adaptation of a *παιάν* to the context of poetics is also found in a short poem by the late Greek poet Mesomedes: 1 (εἰς Μοῦσαν), 8–9.

¹⁵ Lines 97–104; see the discussion of Williams (1978) ad loc. I am reminded of the description of the two sides of Apolline song at the beginning of the second stasimon of Eur. *Her.* (348–9): αἴλιον μὲν ἔπ' εὐτυχεῖ | μολπῇ Φοῖβος ἰαχεῖ ('Phoebus sings *ailinos* after a happy song'). The idea seems to be that Apollo sings a positive song (which, since the singer is Apollo, ought to be a *παιάν*), and then caps it with a refrain, which has a contrasting negative ἡθος. This structure of positive song

Another instance of a link between Apolline duplicity and the *παιάν* is illustrated by an anecdote given by a late source to explain the atheism of Diagoras of Melos.¹⁶ A *παιάν* (presumably in honour of Apollo) composed by Diagoras was plagiarized by another poet; Diagoras accused him, but the plagiarist swore his innocence; the plagiarist then gave a prize-winning performance of Diagoras' song, and Diagoras turned to atheism in disgust. No one would insist on the historicity of this narrative; it is more likely to be a remnant of a largely fictional Hellenistic biography. The point I want to highlight is that into his explanation for Diagoras' disillusionment the writer has incorporated the motif of the *παιάν* as an expression of unfulfilled hope and of the unreliability of Apollo: in composing a *παιάν* Diagoras might have expected to have earned the favour of Apollo, but it was the plagiarist who triumphed.

(f) *Celebratory παιάν preceding a reversal*

In literature celebration is often mentioned just before a reversal in the action, to intensify the effect of the reversal, or alternatively, after the moment of reversal an earlier scene of celebration is sometimes introduced to provide a poignant contrast with the present situation. Reference to joyful *παιᾶνες* became one of the standard features of such scenes of celebration preceding reversal. Some of the odes in Greek tragedy mentioned earlier fit this pattern.¹⁷ Another instance is provided by Thucydides, who has the Greeks singing *παιᾶνες* when the Sicilian expedition sets out (6. 32. 2), and when the expedition fails he observes that their cries were the opposite of the prayers and *παιᾶνες* with which they set sail (7. 75. 7).¹⁸ To take a more *recherché* instance, according to a citation in the *Suda* from an unknown (but quite possibly classical) source, the

followed by negative refrain is a metaphor for the labours of Heracles in the play: the first eleven have been successful, but the last has been disastrous.

¹⁶ See *Suda* s.v. *Διαγόρας* (ii. 53. 10 Adler).

¹⁷ See pp. 114–15.

¹⁸ ἀντὶ δ' εὐχῆς τε καὶ παιάνων, μεθ' ὧν ἐξέπλεον, πάλιν τούτων τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐπιφημίμασιν ἀφορμᾶσθαι ('Instead of the prayer and *παιᾶνες* with which they sailed out, they started off with the opposite cries'). Thucydides may have borrowed this use of the *παιάν* from tragedy; for tragic effects in Thucydides see Macleod (1983). The same idea of *παιάν* preceding disaster may also be present at 2. 91. 2 οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι ὑατέρου ἐπαίνιζόν τε ἅμα πλέοντες ὡς νενικηκότες ('[the Peloponnesians], arriving later at the battle, sang the *παιάν* as they sailed along as if victorious'). Does this mean that they were (hybristically) anticipating victory or were they singing a pre-battle *παιάν* which sounded like a post-battle *παιάν*?

Trojans sang παιᾶνες when they drew the horse into the city, and this scene would have formed a powerful contrast with the sack of the city that was soon to follow.¹⁹

In some cases the use of the joyful παιάν as a symbol of celebration soon to be followed by a reversal seems to reflect not merely the belief that the παιάν was a typical feature of celebration, but a general perception of the παιάν as an ambiguous genre. Thus, at Aesch. *Ag.* 245–7, when the narrative reaches the point of Iphigeneia's sacrifice, there is a flashback to the scene of her father's συμπόσιον, where she answered his παιάν:

ἐπεὶ πολλάκις
πατρός κατ' ἀνδρῶνας εὐτραπέζους
ἐμελψεν, ἀγνᾶ δ' ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾶ πατρός
φίλου τριτόσπονδον εὐποτμον παιῶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.

(For she sang many times in the well-furnished quarters of her father, and chaste and with a holy voice she honoured in a kindly manner her dear father's propitious παιάν sung at the third libation.)

Here the συμπόσιον-παιάν that Iphigeneia 'honoured' (which I take to mean 'responded to by chanting ἢ παιάν') is meant to contrast not only with the less auspicious circumstances of her sacrifice, but also, I would argue, with the παιάν that would have accompanied her sacrifice (which is given a splendid representation in Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*).²⁰ A further example of this form of paeanic ambiguity, which could also perhaps serve to illustrate type (e) above, is Aeschylus fr. 350 Radt, a passage which may have been in the mind of Callimachus when he wrote the introduction to the *Hymn to Apollo*. Thetis, apparently mourning her son, recalls how Apollo had sung at her wedding, predicting a prosperous future for her offspring and adding a παιάν-cry at the end as if to guarantee what he promised (line 4):

ὁ δ' ἔνδατεῖται τὰς ἐμὰς εὐπαιδίας
νόσων τ' ἀπείρους καὶ μακραίωνας βίου
ξύμπαντά τ' εἰπὼν θεοφιλεῖς ἐμὰς τύχας

¹⁹ *Suda* s.v. ἐξάρχοντες (ii. 303. 1 Adler) ᾄδοντες· οἱ δὲ Τρῶες μετὰ θορύβου καὶ ἡδονῆς παιᾶνας ἐξάρχοντες ('Leading off. Singing. The Trojans with noise and joy leading off παιᾶνες'). For other celebrations (not involving παιᾶνες) during the reception of the Trojan horse see Eur. *Tro.* 529; Virg. *Aen.* 2. 239; Tryphiod. 340 ff.; Q.S. 12. 441; also a jubilant παιάν sung by the Theban Ialmenus as he is killed during a raid on Thebes at Stat. *Theb.* 10. 306 (Apollo Paian supports the Argives: *Theb.* 10. 343).

²⁰ The παιάν in the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*: p. 111.

παιᾶν' ἐπηυφήμησεν εὐθυμῶν ἐμέ.
 κὰγὼ τὸ Φοῖβον θεῖον ἀψευδὲς στόμα
 ἤλπιζον εἶναι μαντικῇ βρύον τέχνη·
 ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ὕμνων, αὐτὸς ἐν θοίνῃ παρών,
 αὐτὸς τὰδ' εἰπών, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ κτανὼν
 τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν.

(He discoursed on the quality of my progeny, unacquainted with disease and long-lived; he claimed that my fortune was god-loved in every way, and he added a paean-cry, to my delight. And I hoped that the divine mouth of Apollo would prove truthful, imbued as it is with the mantic art. But he who sang these things, who was present at the wedding-feast, who said these things, he is the one who killed my son.)

We owe the preservation of this fragment to Plato's citation of it in the *Republic* as a disturbing case of the impious representation of the gods in poetry. It is one of the most stunning indictments of Apollo in extant Greek literature: Thetis laments the duplicitous nature of the god's prophecy, and she adds the detail that Apollo uttered a παιᾶν (presumably a παιᾶν-cry, in fact) at the end of his prophecy as if to guarantee the outcome. Such an addition would be particularly appropriate in the context of a wedding, where the use of παιᾶνες and παιᾶν-cries as apotropaic prayers was common. To a reader aware of the genre's ambiguity, and its strong association with Apolline violence, Apollo's singing a παιᾶν at the wedding might appear to have been itself an omen of the future.²¹

There may be a similar ominous allusion in the wedding-παιᾶν that Sappho, 44. 33–4V, depicts as sung at the wedding of Hector and Andromache—which, as Nagy has suggested, probably alludes to the παιᾶν that the Greeks sang over the dead Hector at Hom. *Il.* 22. 391–2.²² Conversely, a poignant echo of the happy παιᾶν-singing that accompanied the wedding of Hector and Andromache in Sappho can be found in Eur. *Tro.* 577 ff.:

Ἄν. Ἀχαιοὶ δεσπότηι μ' ἄγουσιν
 Ἐκ. οἴμοι. Ἄν. τί παιᾶν' ἐμόν στενάζεις
 Ἐκ. αἰαί. Ἄν. τῶνδ' ἀλγέων

²¹ On this fragment see Gantz (1981), 21; Scodel (1977), 55 ff. Euripides seems to imitate Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 350 at *Ion*, 906–10, where Creusa laments the loss of her son (see p. 112).

²² See Nagy (1974), 137–8. There may be other pairs of παιᾶνες standing in a contrastive relationship: in the parodos of the *Agamemnon* Iphigeneia's συμπόσιον-παιᾶν (245–7) contrasts with Calchas' apotropaic παιᾶν (146); and contrast Eur. *Her.* 815 ff. with lines 687 ff. See pp. 114–15.

Ἐκ. ὦ Ζεῦ. Ἀν. καὶ συμφορᾶς;

(AND. Achaean masters lead me . . . HEC. *Oimoi!* AND. Why do you make of my *παιάν* a lament . . . HEC. *Aiai!* AND. . . . for this pain HEC. O Zeus! AND. . . . and disaster?)

The conceit here is that Andromache's being led off into captivity is analogous to a wedding ceremony, in which the bride was led to the house of her husband. By this logic, the lamentations of Hecuba correspond to the *παιᾶνες* that formed part of the wedding ceremony.²³

12. DECLINE AND TRANSFORMATION

(a) *The decline of the Apolline παιάν: Loss of community or canonization?*

The communal Apolline *παιάν* declined quite early. Its floruit, as we have seen, was the archaic period, and even by the late fifth century BC it was largely out of date, except in conservative centres. It was probably not an important genre in Athens in the classical period, except (perhaps) in the context of pilgrimage to major centres of Apolline cult.

Two factors may be seen as having contributed to its decline:

1. I have stressed the important role of the *παιάν* in the communal life of the archaic polis. Where this social fabric breaks down, the chief performance context of the *παιάν* is lost and the genre is out of date. This process will have happened at different times in different centres, but it is likely to have happened at Athens earlier than in some other locations. I would suggest that it survives mostly in the limited and peripheral context of pilgrimages to centres of the cult of Apollo.¹

2. Part of the explanation may have been the spread of a feeling that it was sufficient to reperform older examples of the genre. Archaic *παιᾶνες* such as those of Thaletas or Tynnichus were widely regarded as canonical. This process of canonization had happened particularly early at Sparta, but in other places new *παιᾶνες* were still being composed in the fifth century BC. It may be, however, that in these other places the process of canonization happened

²³ Von Blumenthal (1943), 2350. The marriage *παιάν* may also be alluded to at *IA* 1468: so Foley (1985), 76.

¹ Communal *παιάν*: §6a.

during the fifth century BC or soon after. On the other hand, *παιᾶνες* to Asclepius are still composed in the post-classical period, because the archaic or classical models were less imposing.²

Along with the change in social conditions and canonization of earlier models goes a change in artistic taste: the traditional genres of song and dance will have been regarded as old-fashioned and parochial in an age which demanded novelty and complexity. This reaction might seem particularly likely in Athens, where the avant-garde embraced more fashionable lyric genres—the narrative *διθύραμβος* and citharodic *νόμος*, whose strength lay not in social function, but in artistic virtuosity.³

In the rest of this section I want to look at what happens to the *παῖάν* after the decline. I shall suggest that there are two main directions: first, while the decline of song-dance performance is a serious blow to the genre, it lives on after a fashion in stichic metres, apparently not intended for performance. At this time allusions to performance and to genre become if anything more important, as if to compensate for the loss of performance, and here the example of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* is particularly important. Second, although the addressees of classical *παιᾶνες* and the imitations of them in Greek tragedy already display considerable variation, further artistic deformations are found in the post-classical period, e.g. Philodamus' *παῖάν* to Dionysus.

(b) *Effects of the loss of performance context*

We begin by looking at how the loss of performance context affected the genre in the post-classical period.

(i) *Metrical variations.* In the classical period, while the paeanic performances are accompanied by music and dance, the metrical structures of the song are those we would identify as lyric, and often triadic. Stichic metres are not attested among them. In the post-classical period stichic metres become common, and it seems likely that this change in metrical structure signifies that texts were no longer performed, at least not in such an elaborate way.

² Canonization of the *παῖάν* at Sparta: p. 32.

³ Around this time the theory may have arisen that Apollo's true genre was the citharodic *νόμος*: see Rutherford (1995c). Van Minnen (1997) has recently argued that Timotheus' adaptation of the *παῖάν* at the end of the *Persai* (196 ff.) represents the point when the genre transcends its earlier simpler form, so that 'after Timotheus paians composed in the strict manner . . . can only be deliberate anachronisms'.

Examples of post-classical songs in stichic metres are plentiful. The Delphic παιᾶνες of Limenios and Athenaios are in stichic cretic. Callimachus composed his quasi-paeanic *Hymn to Apollo* in hexameters (see below). The Greek magical papyri contain hexameter παιᾶνες to Apollo, and from the imperial period we have παιᾶνες to Asclepius in hexameters and a παιάν to Telesphorus in anapaests. Such metrical variation can be thought of as 'crossing' between a choral lyric genre and the hexameter form, as we find also in such poems as Bion's *Lament for Adonis*. Callimachus also wrote a *Brankhos*, an imitation of a cult hymn in honour of Didymean Apollo (one thinks of the Milesian *Μολποί!*), relating the foundation of Didyma by Branchus—a quasi-paeanic performance scenario, then. In this case the metre is stichic choriambic, unattested in cult hymns before Callimachus, and probably an innovation.⁴

In the limiting case, verse could be dispensed with entirely and a παιάν could be composed in prose, as Aelius Aristides used prose for writing hymns. Crude examples of verseless παιᾶνες may have been around in the classical period (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 295 ff.).⁵ But for an artistic example we have to wait until the third century AD (or later), when Callistratus wrote his tenth *Eikon* (R85), a rhetorical *ἔκφρασις* on a statue of the god Paian, which seems to take on the function of a παιάν towards the end, where the author describes his speech as the first fruits of discourse, and asserts that he is ready to sing a strain (*νόμος*) if Paian grants (*νέμοις*) health.

(ii) *Generic allusion compensating for loss of performance*: Callimachus, *Hymn 2*. Another consequence of the decline of performance is that post-classical poets sometimes compensate by creating the impression of performance. Allusions to performance are also found in classical lyric poetry, but their purpose (probably) is to recreate an impression of the original performance when the text is reperformed or read on subsequent occasions, whereas in post-classical poetry allusions to performance compensate for the absence of real performance.

The relationship between classical and post-classical manipulation of genre is analogous: in classical poetry genre is intimately tied to function, although formal features, such as generic signatures and refrains, had a role also, and help to recreate an impression of the original performance scenario; but in post-classical poetry the bur-

⁴ Hexameter παιᾶνες: R103–5; R109–12. Call. *Brankhos*: fr. 229 Pfeiffer. See Parke (1967), 55.

⁵ For this passage see pp. 22, 53.

den of genre comes to rest on generic signatures and allusions. It has been suggested that we see this tendency already in the complex refrains and *μεσύνμνια* of some *παιᾶνες* of the fourth century BC, such as Philodamus' *παιάν* to Dionysus (§12(c)(ii)), which are not in evidence in classical examples of the genre.⁶ However, the classical *παιᾶνες* are elaborate creations by skilled composers, whereas those that survive from the fourth century BC and later may belong to a lower, almost subliterate, register. If we had a broader range of data from the fifth century BC and earlier, it might well turn out that conspicuous refrains and *μεσύνμνια* were just as common then.

This tendency towards reliance on formal allusions is better illustrated from Callimachus' hexameter *Hymn to Apollo*, which, like the other *Hymnoi*, was probably written to be read, not for performance (performance at the Cyrenean Karneia is an outside possibility, but the analogy of the other *Hymnoi* points the other way). After an opening in which the poet anticipates an epiphany of Apollo and invokes the young men (8: *νέοι*) whom he imagines as performing it, he appeals for *εὐφημία* (17), supporting this injunction with the example of Thetis and Niobe, who are silent when they hear the *παιάν* though they might have been expected to be disturbed by it (for the irony of this description see §11). The introduction concludes with a further appeal to chant *ἦ ἦ*, which is interpreted to mean that it is impious to fight the immortals (25; Callimachus elaborates the etymology of the *παιάν*-cry further at 97–104).

The central section of the poem which follows presents a catalogue of Apollo's attributes—his wealth, youth, and health (31 ff.), the origin of his epithet *Νόμιος* (46 ff.), and his role as a founder, illustrated by the altar he constructed at Delos (55 ff.). The last theme leads smoothly to an account of his role in the foundation of Cyrene (65 ff.), and of his epithet *Καρνεῖος*, which is derived from Sparta (71 ff.). Immediately after this aetiology, the poet addresses the god with a unique formula beginning *ἦ ἦ Καρνεῖε πολύλλιτε* . . . ('*Hie hie* Karneian one, object of many prayers . . .'), apparently a cross between the *παιάν*-cry and the epithet *Καρνεῖος* (80 ff.).

⁶ Käppel (1992b), 189 ff., also sees complex refrains as late, and argues that the transition might have come about via a song belonging to the first stage, but possessing prominent refrain and *μεσύνμνιον*, e.g. the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius, which was subject to a reinterpretation in which the formal features were taken as essential to the genre—a process which he calls *Automatisierung*, using the language of Russian formalism.

Between the Cyrenean section and the final section of the poem (the *σφραγίς* about the poetics of *φθόνος*), Callimachus inserts an account of the Pythoetonia aetiology of the *παιάν*-cry and the *παιάν* (97 ff.). Part of the purpose of this section is probably to illustrate the destructive side of Apollo's nature, balancing the more peaceful and creative side illustrated by the aetiology of the epithet *Νόμιος*, and the account of his foundations. But this section is not strongly motivated by the context; perhaps, as Erbse suggested, it may have been intended to represent the culmination of the epiphany of Apollo, and to suggest that the joy of the performers was as great as that of the people who witnessed the Pythoetonia.⁷

Lines 97–104 can also be interpreted as a generic signature, identifying the present poem as a *παιάν*. And lines 20–5 could be seen as a signature as well, not to mention lines 80 ff. Generic signatures are in fact more prominent in this hymn than in *Paianes* of the classical period, and it seems to illustrate the tendency I suggested for formal allusions to be more conspicuous when the purpose of composition has ceased to be performance. But is it a *παιάν*? An affirmative answer might seem to follow from *POxy* 2368, according to which Callimachus judged that the element *ῖή* was a sufficient criterion for classification as a *παιάν*, though perhaps that would have applied only to lyric poetry. Ultimately, the answer depends on whether or not a true *παιάν* can be composed in hexameters, or composed for a reason other than song-dance performance. I am strongly tempted to call it a *παιάν*; at the very least, it is a sensitive and beautiful homage to the genre.

(c) *Post-classical extensions in addressee*

(i) *The widening penumbra*. Since the only limitation on the addressee of a *παιάν* is that it is a figure who can be appropriately described by the name 'Paian', there was probably always a good deal of flexibility in the range of addressees. I have already suggested that classical practice can be divided into a core—the communal Apolline *παιάν*—and various well-established peripheral usages, including the *παιάν* to Asclepius and the *παιάν* in commemoration of men. There are also some post-classical developments, which can be viewed as variations or deformations of classical practice. Likely examples of such variations are the use of the *παιάν* to praise living kings and potentates and the *παιάν* to Sarapis, first attested when

⁷ Erbse (1955); Calame (1993).

Demetrius composed the first such *παιάν* at the end of the fourth century BC or the beginning of the third. Aristotle's *παιάν* to Arete (the 'Hermias-song') is another isolated example of a variation.⁸ Schematically:

Classical core	Communal Apolline <i>παιάν</i>
Classical periphery	<i>παιάνες</i> to Asclepius and some other deities; <i>συνπόσιον-παιάν</i> ; <i>παιάν</i> in commemoration of mortals
Post-classical variations	<i>παιάνες</i> in praise of living men, to Sarapis, Arete

Which addressee belongs in which category is sometimes debatable. It could be argued that *παιάνες* in commemoration of the dead should be assigned not to the 'classical periphery' but to post-classical variation, for example.

This model is further complicated by the fact that some variations had a local dimension. An inscription from Thasos (fifth century BC) setting out the cultic honours due to the Nymphs and Apollo explicitly bans *παιάν*-singing, probably because of a perceived incompatibility between *παιάνες* and the worship of the chthonic Nymphs. The Spartans seem to have had a *παιάν* to Poseidon. The Lysander-*παιάν* seems to have originated on Samos; was this a local variation? An entry in Hesychius' *Lexicon* indicates that cult *παιάνες* were addressed to Zeus in Rhodes; if this refers to the Hellenistic period (it might have something to do with the tradition that the Rhodians sang *παιάνες* to Ptolemy Soter in 304 BC), then we could write it off as a post-classical variation. Again, Philostratus reports that in Gadeira *παιάνες* were sung in honour of Death, and only there; although this looks a little like a projection of the linkage between the *παιάν* and death found in tragedy, there is a chance that among the Gadeirites the range of addressees had been extended to include even the deity who would elsewhere have been considered most inappropriate.⁹

(ii) *Artistic variation: The παιάν of Philodamus.* Some post-classical extensions of the genre seem to be artistically contrived, rather like its use in Greek tragedy. A good example here is the mid-fourth-

⁸ *παιάν* and address to Paian: §§2, 7a. Core and periphery: pp. 89–90. *παιάνες* praising men: §51. *παιάνες* in honour of Sarapis: p. 55. Aristotle's *παιάν* to Arete: §9b.

⁹ Thasos: *IG* xii/8. 358(a) (p. 49). Gadeira: Philostr. *VA* 5. 4 (cf. Aelian, fr. 19). *παιάν* to Zeus at Rhodes: Hesych. iii. 253 Schmidt; for the Rhodian *παιάνες* (R71) see p. 57 n. 80.

century *παῖάν* to Dionysus by Philodamus from Scarpheia in Locris and his brothers (a rare instance of collective authorship).¹⁰ This song is identified as a *παῖάν* by the prominent paeanic *μεσύνμιον* and *ἐφύμιον*, and also by the subscription, which refers to it as a *παῖάν* and tells us that it was composed in accordance with an oracle of Apollo, but does not otherwise specify the circumstances. From the song itself we can infer that it was composed for the inauguration of the Sixth Temple at Delphi, probably in the year 340–339 BC;¹¹ and that it was to be performed at the Theoxenia, to which Dionysus is apparently being summoned in the opening lines.¹² It has twelve strophes, four of them (4, 6–8) now lost. The first six probably narrated the birth of Dionysus and his journey via a number of sacred places to Olympus; the latter six were concerned with the establishment of the cult of Dionysus, and injunctions concerning the Theoxenia and the Puthia.

Since Dionysus' special genre was the *διθύραμβος*, a *παῖάν* to Dionysus could be considered as a crossing of two types of song, reflecting what I suggest we call a generic syncretism. This comes out in the *μεσύνμιον*:

εὐοὶ ὦ ἰὸ Βάκχ' ὦ ἰὲ παῖάν
(*Euoî o io Bacchus, o ie paian*)

and an elaborate three-line *ἐφύμιον*:

ἰὲ παῖάν, ἴθι σωτήρ,
εὐφρων τάνδε πόλιν φύλασ'
εὐαίωνι σὺν ὄλβῳ.

(*Ie paian*, come saviour, favour us and guard this city with prosperous good fortune.)

This generic syncretism suggests in turn a religious syncretism. The key question we have to answer is whether the practice of addressing *παῖάνες* to Dionysus at Delphi was an old 'local variation' (analogous to addressing *παῖάνες* to Zeus in Rhodes), or whether it was a more recent innovation.

¹⁰ For collective authorship in a different genre see Halliwell (1989).

¹¹ The date of the song is tied to the archonship of Etymondas at Delphi, which fell in 340–339 BC, according to Marchetti (1977). I follow Rainer's text (though cf. Marcovich (1975), on line 108).

¹² Theoxenic festivals: pp. 310–12. Dionysus is typically a god who arrives: see Otto (1981), 79 ff.; Detienne (1989), 3 ff. A relevant model would be the cletic hymn to Dionysus at the end of Soph. *Ant.* 1115 ff. (an ode analysed as a *παῖάν* by Pozzi (1979)).

Two factors suggest that it might be old. First, Dionysus had been worshipped at Delphi for a very long time. Already in the fifth century BC the inscription of the Labyadae ordained that sacrifices be offered to him in the month of Apellaios (mid-summer); an early role for him may be implied in the enneateric Herois, which Plutarch believed represented the ascent of Semele. And Plutarch also reports that Dionysus was worshipped for three months during the winter.¹³ Secondly, there are suggestions of syncretism between Apollo and Dionysus already in classical literature, particularly in two fragments of Attic tragedy in which Dionysiac epithets are applied to Apollo. One thinks also of the short choral ode in the *Trakhiniai* (205 ff.), which combines Apolline and Dionysiac traits.¹⁴ Mythological prophets such as Melampus and Teiresias or poets such as Orpheus also bridge the Dionysiac and the Apolline spheres.¹⁵ And the idea of Dionysus as an infinitely versatile deity, enunciated by Teiresias in Euripides' *Bacchae* (298 ff.), also supports an intrusion of the Dionysiac into the territory of Apollo.

In this context it seems possible that the practice of addressing *παῖνες* to Dionysus at Delphi was old as well. Rainer suggested that there was already a tradition in Delphic *παῖνες* of linkage between Apollo and other deities, e.g. in the *παῖαν* of Aristonoos, in which Athena's role is important. However, it must be said that Athena's role in that song is markedly subordinate to Apollo's.¹⁶

In fact, despite the evidence cited above, it seems likely that the norm at Delphi was for Dionysus to be honoured with the *διθύραμβος* and not with the Apolline *παῖαν*. The evidence for this is

¹³ Labyadae: *CID* i, nos. 9, 43–5; Stewart (1982), 223 n. 32. Herois: Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 293 c–d; von Pomtow (1901), 2530–1. Winter festival: Plut. *De E ap. Delph.* 389 c; Stewart (1982), 208; Kereñyi (1976), 198.

¹⁴ See Eur. *TGF* 477 (*Likymnius*) δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε Βάκχιε, Παῖαν Ἀπολλων εὐλυρε ('Master, fond of laurel, Bacchic one, Paian Apollo, of the fair lyre'), and Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 341 ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ βακχεϊόμαντις ('Apollo in ivy, Bacchic prophet'). There is a subtler clash of categories at *Sept.* 635 ἀλώσμον παιῶν' ἐπέεϊα κχάσας ('crying out an *iakkhos*-cry, the paean of capture'). For *Tra.* 205 ff. see p. 113. Dionysus is also called 'Paian' at *HOphi.* 52. 11. A musical equivalent is Philoxenus' attempt to compose *διθύραμβοι* in Dorian *ἀρμονία* (the one appropriate to *παῖνες*), reported by Arist. *Pol.* 1342^b (see §7 n. 43).

¹⁵ Melampus: *Bacch.* fr. 4 (Apollo); *Hec.* 2. 49 (Dionysus). Teiresias: Soph. *OT* (Apollo); Eur. *Ba.* (Dionysus). Orpheus: p. 198; Detienne (1985); S. G. Cole (1980), 227 n. 17.

¹⁶ Rainer (1975), 170 ff. Rainer also sees a different sort of syncretism (254 ff. 236 ff.), a blend of traditional lyric and dramatic lyric.

not just Plutarch's testimony in his dialogue on the 'E' at Delphi.¹⁷ The same distinction is implied much earlier in the extraordinary opening to Bacch. *Ode* 16, in which the speaking subject presents his song—a διθύραμβος—as being sung during the period before Apollo returns to Delphi to be greeted by παιᾶνες. This generic contrast would be subverted if there had been a general awareness in the classical period of παιάν performance in honour of Dionysus at Delphi.¹⁸

So it begins to look as if Philodamus' παιάν represents generic transgression after all. More important, as Käppel has recently shown, Philodamus' song seems to invite interpretation as a generic innovation. Two moments in the song are of special importance here. First, the earlier half of the song seems to culminate in the arrival of Dionysus on Olympus (strophe 5), where Apollo and the Muses crown themselves with ivy and form a sort of singing crown around him, hailing him as παιάν:

ε' [ἐ]ν[θεν ἀ]π' ὀλβίας χθονὸς
 Θεο[σαλίας] ἐκελσας ἄσ-
 55 τη τέμενός τ' Ὀλύμπι[ον]
 [Πιερ]ίαν τε κλειτάν·
 εὐοῖ ᾧ ἰὸ Βάκχ', [ᾧ ἱὲ παι]άν·
 Μοῦσαι [δ'] αὐτίκα παρθένοι
 κ[ισσῶ] στε[ψ]άμεναι κύκλῳ σε πᾶσαι
 60 μ[έλψαν] ἀθάνα[τον] εἰς αἶε
 παιάν' εὐκλέα τ' ὀ[πρὶ κλέο]υ-
 σαι, [κα]τάρξε δ' Ἀπόλλων
 ἱὲ παιά[ν, ἴθι σ]ωτήρ κτλ.

([5] Then from the blessed land [sc. of Delphi] you put in at the towns of Thessaly, and the sacred grove of Olympus, and famous Pieria (*meshum-nion*). The virgin Muses at once crowning themselves with ivy sang of you, all of them in a circle, calling you immortal Paian and famous for ever, and Apollo led the song (*refrain*).)

Käppel suggests that this verse marks not only the point in the story of Dionysus when it became legitimate to call him παιάν, but also the point in the performance of Philodamus' song when call-

¹⁷ *De E ap. Delph.* 389c τὸν μὲν ἄλλον ἐνιαυτὸν παιᾶνι χρώνται περὶ τὰς θυσίας, ἀρχομένου δὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐπεγείραντες τὸν διθύραμβον τὸν δὲ παιᾶνα καταπαύσαντες, τρεῖς μῆνας ἀντ' ἐκείνου τοῦτον κατακαλοῦνται τὸν θεόν ('The rest of the year they employ the παιάν for sacrifices, but when the winter starts they raise the διθύραμβος and put to rest the παιάν, and invoke the god by this title instead of that for three months').

¹⁸ On this song see above, pp. 88–9.

ing it a *παῖάν* becomes legitimate, in so far as for a song to merit the designation *παῖάν* it must be dedicated to a deity invoked as *παῖάν*. It therefore follows for him that Philodamus' *παῖάν* exhibits an unprecedented degree of generic self-awareness. The second key moment is the point when Apollo is said to have commanded that the song be performed at the Theoxenia (strophe 9, lines 110–12). These lines are usually taken to indicate merely that Apollo ordered the composition of the song; but we can also take them as enjoining that Apollo's genre—the *παῖάν*—be used in the worship of Dionysus, just as it was Apollo's singing that bestowed the title *παῖάν* on Dionysus in strophe 5. It is almost as if part of the justification for the song's being a *παῖάν* is that it was ordered by Apollo. At any rate, the considerable apparatus that justifies the genre of the song seems to indicate that addressing a *παῖάν* to Dionysus is an original idea.¹⁹

Corroboration of the view that this generic crossing may reflect contemporary attitudes has been discovered by Andrew Stewart, who points to a possible iconographical parallel in representations of the two deities on the pediments of the temple: Apollo and his entourage on the east pediment and Dionysus surrounded by Thyiades on the west pediment (described in strophe 11). Stewart argues that the stance and attire of the figure of Dionysus on the west pediment and the fact that he seems to be holding a *κιθάρα* are meant to suggest the contemporary iconography of Apollo *κιθαρωδός*. He suggests that this innovation in iconography and Philodamus' *παῖάν* can be seen as contemporary expressions in different media of the same syncretistic idea in which Dionysus is assimilated to Apollo. This, then, would be a further piece of evidence that the religious and generic syncretism implied in the song is specifically tied to the late fourth century BC.²⁰

For a parallel to the religious and generic syncretism implied in the refrain of Philodamus' *παῖάν* we may turn to Aelius Aristides, an accomplished writer of hymns, both in prose and verse, who mentions in his *Hymn to Heracles* that he had been the subject of

¹⁹ Käppel (1992b) 243 ff. On generic self-awareness see Käppel (1992b), 277 ff. I would compare the aetiology of the title 'Paian' in lines 15 ff. of Limenios' *παῖάν*.

²⁰ Stewart (1982), 209; Paus. 10. 19. 4. For archaeological evidence see Stewart (1982), 222 n. 20, referring to Croissant (1980); Croissant may be right in his conjecture that *δύσις* . . . *Ἑλλίου* in the text of Pausanias represents a corruption of an expression describing the western gable.

a dream by a stranger—a native of Thasos or Macedonia. In the stranger's dream Aristides had composed a song with the composite refrain *ἰὴ Παιάν* "Ἡρακλες Ἀσκληπιέ (40. 21):²¹

εἰ δ' ὀρθῇ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ ξένου ἦτοι Μακεδόνοιο γε, ὃς ἔφη ποτὲ παιάνα δόξαι
ἄδειν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πεποιημένον, εἶναι δ' αὐτῷ τοῦτο ἐπαδόμενον, *ἰὴ Παιάν* "Ἡρακλες
Ἀσκληπιέ, εἰ ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ καὶ κύρια, καλὸν ἂν τι χρῆμα καὶ τοῦτο συζυγίας
πεφηνός, ὁ καλλίνικος ἅμα τῷ σωτήρι.

(And if the dream of the Thasian stranger or the Macedonian one were right, who said that he dreamt that he was singing a paean composed by me, and that it had the refrain *ie Paian Heracles Asclepius*, if this is true and right, what an excellent conjunction that would be that had appeared to him—the Victorious One (*καλλίνικος*) with the Saviour.)

Aristides notes that the refrain links Asclepius and Heracles. So far the syncretism is only religious, but there is a suggestion of generic syncretism in the epithet *καλλίνικος* which Aristides applies to Heracles in his description of the song; this epithet strongly suggests the ritual formula of victory used at Olympia, *τήνελλα καλλίνικε, χαίρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις* ('Tenella, noble in victory, hail, lord Heracles'), which was attributed to Archilochus (*IEG* 324) and called ὁ καλλίνικος by Pindar at the start of *Ol.* 9. It looks as if Aristides interprets his dream-song as a cross between a *παιάν* to Asclepius and the *καλλίνικος* to Heracles.²²

²¹ Also *Hier. log.* 4 (50). 42 = *GDRK* 2 Sz. One could compare the composite ritual cry *ἐλεεῦ, ἰού, ἰού* described at Plut. *Thes.* 22. 3. Other syncretistic *παιάνες* may be some late epigrams for the Nubian deity Mandaules (=Horus=Apollo) (R81-2).

²² *καλλίνικος*: Dr i. 266-7; Kurke (1988), 103 ff.; Burnett (1983), 26. The two formulae are crossed also at Ar. *Birds*, 1763-4.

Pindar's *Paeanes*

13. RECONSTRUCTING THE ANCIENT EDITION

The Hellenistic edition of Pindar contained a single book-roll of *Paianes*.¹ A number of papyri contribute to our knowledge of this book. The most important source remains *POxy* 841 (henceforth Π^4),² a papyrus from the second century AD, edited by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908 (in *POxy* v). The fact that some of the fragments of a papyrus come from *Paianes* does not mean that all of them do, but there is no good reason to think that any of the fragments of this papyrus belong to any other genre.³

Since 1908 several papyri have been published which have some degree of overlap with Π^4 . All probably date from the second century AD, or thereabouts. Several fragments from a codex of the second century AD were published by Vitelli and Norsa in 1913 as *PSI* ii. 47 (Π^5); the largest contribute to D6–7. *POxy* 1791 (Π^6), published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1922 in volume xv, contributes to B2. *POxy* 1792 (Π^7), also published in volume xv and re-edited with new fragments by Lobel in 1961 (volume xxvi), has been thought to contribute to the third triad of D6, though this is no longer certain, now that it has been established that this text also occurred in the *Prosodia*. *POxy* 2440 (Π^{28}), published by Lobel in volume xxvi, contributes to C1–2 and to B2. *POxy* 2442 (Π^{26}), also published by Lobel in volume xxvi, one of the most important Pindaric papyri, contributes to C1–2 and to B2–3. The most recent to

¹ The lists of books are cited in §14 n. 18. Croenert (1908) suggested that there were two books, on the basis of Amm. *De diff. verb.* 231 (Pind. fr. 66 SnMae = F3 below), but this seems to refer to two books of a commentary by Didymus. Wilamowitz (1922), 185, tried to sustain the hypothesis that this passage referred to two books by emending to τοῦ πρώτου, but this is unlikely. Meineke (1860–4), vol. ii, pp. cli–clii, had suggested emending the text of F1 (see apparatus there) to imply that there was a reference to a fifth book of Pindaric *Paianes*. See Bona (1988), xxi; Irigoin (1952), 67.

² For the papyri I judged it most convenient to continue the Π sigla employed by Snell and Maehler, glossed by them on pp. vi–vii of their editions. A synopsis is provided in the Note on the Text at the start of Part II below.

³ But see pp. 193–4 on A1.

appear is *POxy* 3822 (Π^{15}), published by Maehler in 1989 in volume lvi, which contributes to B2.

In the case of Π^7 and Π^{26} it is pretty certain that some of the fragments come from genres other than the *Paian*; we might explain this by saying that the surviving fragments represent either one very large papyrus roll or several of regular size written in the same hand. It follows that it is an unsafe assumption that all the fragments of Π^5 , Π^{28} , and Π^{45} come from *Paianes*.

Some papyri are connected to Π^4 at a second remove: *PBerol* 13411 (Π^8) and *POxy* 2441 (Π^{29}) have overlaps with Π^7 , which (as we have seen) may in turn overlap with Π^4 ; and *POxy* 408 (Π^{11}) overlaps with Π^{26} , which in turn has overlaps with Π^4 .

But even papyri which do not have such secondary overlaps with Π^4 could in principle contribute to the *Paianes*; thus, *POxy* 2448 (Π^{34}) overlaps with none of the above papyri, but the Apolline themes contained within it suggest that it might be from a *Paian*.⁴

Finally, in addition to the contributions of the papyri, other fragments survive because they are cited in works that come down to us via conventional manuscript paradosis; the *Paianes* are explicitly stated to be the source for one fragment of text and a number of testimonia, and they could be the source for a number of others.

In my presentation of the fragments, I have developed a new system of categories. There were several reasons for this decision. First, the conventional enumeration (which is based on Grenfell and Hunt's ordering) does not accord with the likely order of the fragments (see below). Second, it suggests certain questionable relationships between the fragments: for example, one would expect from the enumeration that the small but significant fragments *Pa.* VIIc(a), *Pa.* VIIc(b), *Pa.* VIIc(c), and *Pa.* VIIc(d) belong with *Pa.* VIIc, but there is no special reason to suppose that they do. Finally, the conventional enumeration presupposes generic identifications (for example, the name '*Pa.* XVIII' implies that this fragment comes from a *Paian*), but this creates awkwardness when it comes to discussing the generic identity, an issue already confusing enough when we have to deal simultaneously both with the

⁴ The relatively large number of papyri that have survived suggests that the *Paianes* were read more than any other genre of Pindar's songs in Roman Egypt (see Irigoin (1952), 97). It is tempting to connect this popularity with the fact that the *παίαν* was still a living genre in Egypt (see p. 61 n. 7 on the *παλιανιστά*).

classical system of genres and with the generic interpretations of Hellenistic editors.

I have organized the fragments into eight groups and two supplements. Groups A–E comprise fragments of songs that were certainly classed as *Paianes* in the Hellenistic edition, i.e. fragments from Π^4 or ones which we can be sure were in Π^4 . The basis for the division is the handwriting on the recto and verso (see below). Group F comprises fragments explicitly assigned to *Paianes* in the manuscript paradosis (both testimonia and fragments of text). Group G comprises other papyrus fragments that in my judgement may come from *Paianes*. This category includes fragments with no direct link to Π^4 , but which are contributed by papyri which certainly included *Paianes* (Π^{26} , Π^{28}); and songs represented by papyri which we do not know to have included *Paianes* but which may nevertheless come from *Paianes* (Π^7 , Π^{14}). Finally, Group H comprises some manuscript fragments that could come from *Paianes*.

In two supplementary groups I have included larger fragments of Π^7 and Π^{26} probably not from *Paianes* (Supplement 1, or 'S': 'Dubious *Paianes*'); and second, some fragments of Π^4 , Π^7 , Π^{26} , Π^{28} , and Π^{45} too small to allow us to hypothesize about the genre (Supplement 2, or 'Z'). As in the case of Groups A, B, and C, I have omitted many of the less significant fragments.

The foundation of our knowledge of the *Paian*-book is Π^4 . The text is written on the verso in columns of 15–17 lines, short compared to the much taller columns of Π^{26} (40 lines plus).⁵ The lines are unusually far apart (about half an inch), and the margins are of unusual width (about two inches), perhaps to accommodate scholia.⁶ The recto comprises a census-list. The text is colometrized, without *scriptio plena*,⁷ and equipped with accents (the system used is the early Hellenistic one in which a high tone is represented by a grave on the preceding syllables).⁸ Titles are written in the margins, unlike most of the other papyri that contribute to the *Paianes*, where they were written inset in the column (see §14e). The *παράγραφος* marks strophe divisions, the coronis marks triad-end (strophe-end in D₅; the practice in Π^{26} was perhaps different, to judge from S₂). The asterisk is attested only once, at the division between D₅ and D₆, right above the marginal title, as in POxy 2441, fr. 1 (=S₃–4);

⁵ For Π^4 see below, p. 141; for Π^{26} see pp. 165, 252 n. 33.

⁶ See p. 149.

⁷ Exceptions are the $\tau\epsilon$ at B₃. 16; D₃. 15; and perhaps at E₁. 3.

⁸ For the accentuation see Radt (1958), 7 and n. 1; see also Moore-Blunt (1978).

in both cases it seems to mark the beginning of a song (contrast the view of Hephaestion, that the asterisk marks the end of a song). Perhaps we should think of the asterisk as in attendance on the marginal title below, rather as in *PSI* x. 1181 (=Bacch. fr. 60-1) a title written in the column is surrounded by asterisks.⁹ The διπλῆ (>) and χ, both ways of marking a passage as particularly important, are attested in Groups A and B. In Groups C and D a sublinear hyphen is four times attested, but its force is problematic, since it does not (as elsewhere) indicate that two parts of a compound word belong together. The virgule (/) occurs once in section D, in the scholia of A3.¹⁰

The styles of handwriting in the papyri of the *Paianes* can be grouped on a scale ranging from comparatively slow and formal to comparatively rapid and informal. Nearer the former pole should be classed the hands of Π⁵ (lines cramped together), Π⁶ (smaller), Π⁸ (very regular), Π²⁹ (flattened), Π³⁴ (angular), Π¹¹, and Π⁴⁵. Nearer the second pole should be classed the hands of Π⁷, Π²⁶, Π²⁸ (the last two both sloping).¹¹ Π⁴ is unusual in that the text of the songs (on the verso) is written in two distinct hands, or styles of hand, both comparatively slow and formal: one, the better represented, is plain; the other, rarer one is more elaborate and hooked.

With the help of stichometric symbols written in the margin of the papyrus ($I=900$, $M=1,200$, $N=1,300$), it has been possible to reconstruct an almost continuous section comprising lines 870-1350 (representing coll. 60-90 of a sequence), and containing fragments of at least seven *Paianes* (*Pa.* I-VII).¹² This is all in the plainer hand. Grenfell and Hunt called it section A. Other fragments written in the plainer hand have been shown with the help of other papyri to

⁹ Coronis: see Stephen (1959), 5 n. 15. Asterisk: Heph. *Peri Sem.* 74. 5. GH and Radt both imply that the asterisk marks the start in their editions, but Stephen (1959), 6, says it marks the end; so too Turner (1987), 14, on S3-4. The asterisk is also attested in Π⁷ (=Z9-10 and Z11-12).

¹⁰ The hyphen occurs beneath the syllables αι and φαι at B3. 19; beneath χει and Την- at A1. 35, 41. It links two parts of a compound in S7. 5 and in Z25 (Π²⁶ fr. 87. 3); also at Π²⁶ fr. 45. 1. See Turner (1987), 13 n. 7, referring to Dion. Thrax, *Ars*, suppl. 1, 113-14 Uhlig. For the virgule see McNamee (1992), 17, 35; Flock (1908), 32.

¹¹ Turner (1987) is a good guide here. A comprehensive study of the handwriting of literary papyri is much needed.

¹² $I=900$ at col. 3. 5=D2. 25; $M=1,200$ at col. 23. 4=D6. 7; $N=1,300$ at col. 29. 14=D6. 108. For other cases of stichometric symbols in the margin see Irigoin (1952), 39, and add Stes. *SLG* 133a. 9 (=PMGF S133a 9): Ἄ. *Geryoneis* (*SLG* 27 (=PMGF S27) col. ii. 6=POxy 2617 fr. 7): N; 'Thebaid' (PMGF 222b): f.

contribute to one more song (*Pa.* VIIb, Grenfell and Hunt's section B). This song cannot be placed with respect to section A; the fragments are significantly dirtier than those of section A, but this factor provides no clear guidance.¹³

On the other side of sections A and B of Π^+ (the 'recto') is a census-list from some time after the death of the Emperor Titus. Since the text on the recto is arranged in more or less regular columns (16–18 cm. apart), the position of a column of text on the recto can sometimes provide a clue about the position of a fragment.¹⁴

The fragments in the more elaborate, hooked hand contribute to several more songs. The recto of some of these—Grenfell and Hunt's section C—is in the same hand as that of sections A and B. With the help of other papyri it has been possible to reconstruct a sequence of three songs (*Pa.* VIIId–VIIIa). However, other fragments with the verso in the elaborate hand have a more rounded script on the recto.¹⁵ These contribute *Pa.* IX–X; Grenfell and Hunt called them 'section D', though there is no suggestion that the three fragments were contiguous.

Another difference between the sections concerns the height of the columns. In section A most columns have 15 lines, but of the columns reconstructed in the other three sections (far fewer), none has fewer than 16 lines, and one, the only one reconstructed for section B, has 17 lines.¹⁶

¹³ Thus, for example, papyrus texture has misleading implications for arranging the fragments of the Lille Stesichorus: see Bremer, van Erp Taalman Kip, and Slings (1987), 128.

¹⁴ Partly transcribed in *POxy* vi. 323–4 as *POxy* 984; mentioned in Hombert and Préaux (1952), 135; now wholly transcribed in Bagnall, Frier, and Rutherford (1997); I refer to this census list as *POxy* 984a to distinguish it from the one on the recto of section D. For the sake of convenience I refer to columns of the recto by section of the papyrus: thus, 'AR 3' is the third column that is or can be presumed to have been in section A. A *terminus post quem* for *POxy* 984a is provided by a reference to the Emperor Titus (AR 12. 8). Bagnall ap. Bagnall, Frier, and Rutherford (1997) suggests that it refers to Ptolemais in Upper Egypt. The recto is of use, for example, in confirming that the column containing C₃ (*Pa.* VIIc) comes immediately after the columns containing C₂ (*Pa.* VIIb) in Π^+ (see p. 253).

¹⁵ I call the recto of section D 'POxy 984b'.

¹⁶ In section A (the sections of the papyrus are explained below) the 16-line columns are col. 17 (D4. 21 ff.) and col. 29 (D6. 95 ff.); the rest have 15 lines. In section D both surviving columns (that comprising the surviving section of A2 (*Pa.* Xa = fr. 129–35) and that comprising the second half of A1 (*Pa.* IX = 'col. 4')) have 16 lines. In section C the single column that survives complete (fr. 82, col. 1 (B3 (*Pa.* VIIa)) had 16 lines, and note that fr. 83–4 *may* have had 16 lines. In section B the one surviving column (fr. 16 = C2 (*Pa.* VIIb)) seems to have 17 lines.

Grenfell and Hunt suggested that frs. 26–7 were exceptions to their classification, on the grounds that they have the Pindaric text in the plainer hand but a third hand, similar to that of section D, on the recto. I am not convinced of this: the hand is not altogether clear; furthermore, at some points the back of the papyrus has been strengthened by the addition of a strip of papyrus,¹⁷ and the recto of frs. 26–7 might be part of such a strip. Nevertheless, methodological rigour requires that we place frs. 26–7 in a separate category.

The differences in handwriting can be used as a basis for establishing possible orders for the various sections, assuming that sections in the same hand were contiguous. Clearly A and B belong together, C belongs with them, and D comes next to C. The possible orders would therefore be (AB)CD and DC(AB), where (AB) is short for 'AB or BA'.

The stichometric symbols in section A are most obviously taken as referring to lines of a book-roll containing Pindar's *Paianes* and nothing else. They might also refer to the lines of Pindar's *Paianes* even if these were divided between two rolls (that might explain the two hands). Two other possibilities deserve to be mentioned. First, in principle the stichometric symbols in section A might refer not to the lines of the *Paian*-book, but to lines of a book-roll. For example, Π⁴ might represent an edition of Pindar's *Paianes* divided between two papyrus-rolls, and section A might come from the second. This possibility needs to be mentioned because it is entertained by Grenfell and Hunt and also by Radt.¹⁸ However, if the total number of lines of the *Paianes* of Pindar included in the Hellenistic edition of Pindar was as high as 3,000 (which is what this hypothesis would require), we would expect them to have been divided into two books. Alternatively, the stichometric symbols might refer to a book-roll which included a few songs from some other genre and some or all of the *Paianes*, so that section A would represent *Paianes* grouped rather earlier in the *Paian*-book; but that also seems a very long shot. These possibilities being eliminated, it follows that the stichometric symbols probably refer to lines of a book-roll containing the *Paianes*.¹⁹

If it is a reasonable hypothesis that the *Paian*-book contained no

¹⁷ We find such strengthening-strips on the recto corresponding to col. 8 of section A (my 'AR 23'), also corresponding to col. 23 of the verso (my 'AR 11'), fr. 131 (A2) and frs. 83–4 (part of B2).

¹⁸ Radt (1958), 5.
¹⁹ For similar speculations about the arrangement of Simonides' *Paianes* see Rutherford (1990), 201 ff.

more than 2,000 lines, section A probably came in the latter section, perhaps from near the end of the roll.²⁰ This limits the possible orders to DC(AB). For the same reason, section B probably comes before section A.²¹

TABLE 3. *Grouping of the Papyrus Fragments of the Paianes*

Group	G-H's section	Snell-Maehler	Text (verso)	Document (recto)
A	D	<i>Pa.</i> IX-X	Elaborate hand	Rarer hand
B	C	<i>Pa.</i> VIId-VIIIa	Elaborate hand	More common hand
C	B	<i>Pa.</i> VIIa-b	Plain hand	More common hand
D	A	<i>Pa.</i> I-VII	Plain hand	More common hand
E	—	<i>Pa.</i> VIIc(a)	Plain hand	Third hand (?)

My new enumeration presupposes the order DCBA. To make it smoother, I have reversed the order of letters used by Grenfell and Hunt. Fragments in section D I call 'Group A', fragments that can be associated with section C I call 'Group B', and so on. Grenfell and Hunt's fr. 26-7, which do not seem to fit any of their sections, I class as Group E. This is set out in Table 3. Although I have included more of the smaller fragments than other editors, I have still not included all of Π⁴; Grenfell and Hunt's edition of Π⁴ contained 162 fragments, and I have omitted about 70 of the less significant ones.²²

²⁰ Compare the following figures for the length of rolls of *Epinikia: Olympians* 1,562; *Pythians* 1,983; *Nemeans* 1,273; *Isthmians* more than 752. The first book of Sappho's songs had 1,320 verses (cf. 30V); Bacch. fr. 64 has the sign Ξ = 1,400; Lycophron's *Alexandra* has 1,474 lines; Aratus' *Phaenomena* and *Prognostica* together have 1,154 lines; Callimachus' *Hymns* total 1,083 lines; the books of Apollonius' *Argonautica* range from 1,248 (bk. 2) to 1,779 (bk. 4); a fragment of Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* (PMGF S27) has the symbol \tilde{N} = 1,300; Page (1973) argues that the *Geryoneis* occupied a book-roll of over 1,560 lines. For the lengths of book-rolls see Irigoin (1952), 40; Nagy (1990), 111 n. 155.

²¹ For Irigoin's hypothesis that C2 and D1 belong to the same song see D1 n. 1. Snell (1938), 424 ff., thinks that a regular pattern of insect-holes, which in his view get narrower towards the right, can be used to corroborate this arrangement, but I have been unable to confirm this.

²² The complete list of fragments I omit is as follows: Π⁴, fr. 23-5, 29-32, 34-45, 49-64, 66-9, 71-80, 85, 113-25, 132-3, 135-7, 140, 145-7, 148-60; Π⁵, all except fr. 13; Π⁷, all except those listed in the checklist, p. 471; Π⁸, all except (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k); Π¹⁰, all except those listed in the checklist, p. 471; Π34, fr. 2(c), (d), 4-6, 8-18; Π¹¹, fr. 7.

14. HISTORY OF THE TEXT

(a) *Early publication on stone*

About the transmission of the *Paianes* from the fifth century BC to the third we have no information.¹ From the fourth century BC we have *παιᾶνες* on stone dedicated at Delphi and Epidauros, and from much later we have a *παιάν* to Asclepius by Sophocles dedicated in the Asclepium in Athens.² It seems a reasonable hypothesis that many more *παιᾶνες* were dedicated in temples in the fifth century BC, if not on stone at least on some other durable material such as wood. Some were probably kept at the major religious centres, such as Delos and Delphi.³ A cautionary note is sounded by a testimony of Plutarch to the effect that the '*Paianes* of Pindar' were not inscribed on the temple at Delphi, but even if that is reliable, it does not rule out the possibility that the texts of songs were kept inside.⁴ I would suggest also that they might have been kept in the shrines of the states involved. For example, a song for an Aeginetan *χορός* might have been kept in the Thearion at Aegina, and a song written for the Athenian Puthais to Delphi might have been kept in the temple of Zeus Astrapaïos at Athens, the starting-point of the procession. One reason for this might have been utility: reperformance was always a possibility (see §20); but the main reason would have been that the text of the song was seen as an offering to the god. There is plenty

¹ It is worth mentioning two echoes of the *Paianes* in the literature of the 5th–4th cents. BC: A1 in Soph. *Ant.* 100ff. (see p. 199); and C2. 19–20 in Plato, *Phaedr.* 245 A: *ὅς δ' ἂν ἄνευ μανίας Μουσῶν ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται* ('whoever without the madness of the Muses reaches the gates of poetry'). This echo was pointed out by Friedländer (1941). I wonder if an echo of B2. 2–3 is not to be recognized at Plato, *Theaet.* 173 E.

² Delphi: the *παιάν* of Philodamus (pp. 131–5); Epidauros: *παιάν* of Isyllus (p. 41); Sophocles' *παιάν*: p. 39.

³ Wilamowitz (1893), 38 ff., thought that there were stores of sacred songs at Delos; Herington (1985), 201 ff., has an excellent survey; *τῶν καλουμένων Δελφικῶν*, mentioned by Choeroboscus (see p. 77), may perhaps have been a store of songs kept at Delphi. For detailed criticism of Wilamowitz's hypothesis that a collection of Delian songs (*τὰ Δελιακά*) were kept at Delos see Rutherford (1990), 203ff. See also Irigoín (1952), 8–9.

⁴ Plut. *De garrul.* 511 B καὶ τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Πυθίου Ἀπόλλωνος οὐ τὴν Ἰλιάδα καὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν οὐδὲ τοὺς Πινδάρου παιᾶνας ἐπέγραψαν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες, ἀλλὰ τὸ "γνώθι σεαυτὸν" καὶ τὸ "μηδὲν ἄγαν" καὶ τὸ "ἐγγύα, πάρα δ' ἄτα" ('And in the temple of Pythian Apollo the Amphictyones did not inscribe the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* or the *Paianes* of Pindar, but "Know yourself" and "Nothing too much" and "A pledge, and destruction is near").

of evidence for such dedications from later centuries: Macedonicus of Amphipolis says in the short prose introduction to his *παιάν* that he composed it at the bidding of Apollo.⁵ Aelius Aristides composed a *παιάν* as the result of a dream.⁶ Pindar talks in one fragment about ‘sacrificing a *διθύραμβος*’, and this metaphor seems to imply the idea of ‘song as offering’.⁷ The clearest account of a dedication comes from Isyllus of Epidauros. In section D of the inscription (in prose) he gives an account of how he had the song inscribed on the instructions of the Delphic oracle.⁸ Isyllus dedicated not just the *παιάν* but a series of compositions: a preface in prose, followed by a philosophical introduction in trochaic tetrameters (A), a poem in hexameters setting out a sacred law (B), a shorter poem claiming importance for the cult of Apollo Maleatas (C), the explanation for the dedication (D), the *παιάν* itself (E), and finally a hexameter poem explaining how Isyllus was won over to the worship of Asclepius while still a child (F). Although some dedicatory inscriptions are simpler, containing only the song and a short title, the norm seems to be for them to contain a number of elements. Thus, an inscription of the fourth century BC from Erythrae has instructions relating to cult practice and the beginning of a *παιάν* to Apollo on the front, and on the back the end of the *παιάν* to Apollo, a copy of the ‘Erythraean’ (possibly Sophoclean) *παιάν* to Asclepius, and the start of a *παιάν* to Seleukos. Another Epidaurian inscription (*IG* iv/1(2). 132–4) contains Ariphron’s *παιάν*, a hymn to Asclepius, and a hymn to Athena. The Sarapion monument from the Athenian agora (second century AD) contains an introduction and Sarapion’s poems on the front, a list of *παιανισταί* on the left side, and Sophocles’ *παιάν* on the right. And the Kassel stone transmits four songs, among them Ariphron’s *παιάν* to Health. If one had to extrapolate about hypothetical dedicatory inscriptions from the fifth century BC, one would have to say that some may have included only the song, but others may have contained several sections giving the full

⁵ *Μακεδονικὸς Ἀμφιπολεῖτης* | ἐποίησεν τοῦ θεοῦ προστάξαντο[s] (‘Composed by Macedonicus of Amphipolis at the god’s command’). This title is not included in the text of the song in *CA* 138, but see Pordomingo Pardo (1984), 104.

⁶ This was the *παιάν* beginning *φορμύγγων ἀνακτα Παιᾶνα κληῖσω* (‘I shall sing Paian, lord of the *φόρμιγγες*’), mentioned in *Hier. log.* 4 (50). 31 (=S2. 3 in *GDRK* = R75); other *παιάνες* by Aristides are listed in R76–8.

⁷ Pind. fr. 86a; see the discussion of Svenbro (1984), 929–30; Pindar may say that Xenocritus dedicated (*ἀνθήκεν*) his *παιάν* in G9. 7; for the idea of sacrifice of poetry see also D6 n. 75.

⁸ For Isyllus see p. 41.

context. Some literary *παιᾶνες* might have come down to Hellenistic commentators in this form.⁹

(b) *Aristophanes of Byzantium*

The earliest literary scholars were probably the poets. An early poet with opinions about literary genre which made an impression on later critics was Pratinas of Phleius, who was later cited for the view that Xenodamus wrote *ὑπορχήματα* rather than *παιᾶνες*.¹⁰ Views about generic categories are also expressed in the proems of Pindaric songs such as *Thr.* III (fr. 128c) and G9. The first sign of an independent literary scholarship is that of Glaukos of Rhegion in the late fifth century BC, whose *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* included discussion of the early use of the *παιάν* in Sparta. From the fourth century BC the evidence increases: we hear of a certain Agenor of Mytilene, an expert on lyric poetry, who was perhaps an early editor; the critical works of Heracleides of Pontus probably included opinions about genre; Semos of Delos wrote a work *On Paines* (of uncertain date; perhaps the third century BC is more likely than the fourth), and this may have contained discussions of *παιᾶνες* by classical poets. From the Hellenistic period we have the discussion of Aristotle's Hermias-song attributed to Hermippus the Callimachean.¹¹

Aristophanes of Byzantium in the late third century BC is often thought to have been the Hellenistic scholar who created an edition of Pindar, but the extent of his contribution is unclear. A surviving *Life of Pindar* seems to say that he was responsible for the architectonic organization of the songs into seventeen books, and according to one of the *Lives* transmitted by manuscript it was Aristophanes who placed *Olympian* 1 at the start of the *Epinikia*.¹² Other evidence suggests that he may have made a contribution to the colometry.¹³ However, it is possible that such reports under-

⁹ Erythraean inscription: pp. 21, 39–41; *LSAM* no. 24; Epidaurian inscription: p. 42; Sarapion inscription: pp. 39, 42; Kassel stone: p. 42.

¹⁰ It is uncertain whether Pratinas' opinions were included in his songs, or were published in a prose manual: see F. Stoessl, *RE* xlv. 1727.

¹¹ Agenor: Isocr. *Ep.* 8. 4 with Nagy (1996), 192–3; Hermippus the Callimachean: see p. 94; Semos of Delos: Jacoby on *FGrH* 396 F 23–4 and IIIb *Kommentar* (Text), 204.

¹² The evidence for Aristophanes' edition is collected in Slater (1986), fr. 381 (*POxy* 2438. 35; Dr i. 7. 14 = *Vit. Thom.*).

¹³ See Ar. Byz. fr. 380a (*SPind. Ol.* 2. 27a (Dr i. 73. 5)), B (D.H. *De comp. verb.* 156).

estimate the contribution of earlier scholars. Colometrized texts probably existed before Aristophanes;¹⁴ a scholion on *Pythian* 2 suggests that even Callimachus had been interested in the classification of Pindar's works.¹⁵ Crude, uncolometrized editions of the lyric poets may have existed long before the era of the Hellenistic editors, and the all-important transfer of texts from private ownership or temple depositories into a published edition may have taken place comparatively early.

(c) *Alternative editions*

Was there one definitive edition of Pindar? Or were there several? What makes the question worth raising is that there are indications of the existence of more than one edition in the case of other lyric poets: Hephaestion mentions two editions of Alcaeus, τὴν Ἀριστοφάνειον ἔκδοσιν ('the Aristophanic edition') and τὴν νῦν τὴν Ἀριστάρχειον ('the present Aristarchian edition'), and he refers to τὴν νῦν ἔκδοσιν ('the present edition') of Anacreon, which implies an earlier edition also.¹⁶

One's impression is that most copies of Pindar in circulation were more or less uniform. For example, in cases where we can compare the order of songs in different papyri we find that it is consistent.¹⁷ Where we do find conflicting accounts is in the order of books: besides the arrangement attributed to Aristophanes in *POxy* 2438, others are reported in the Ambrosian Life (also in Eustathius) and in the *Suda*;¹⁸ the origin of the other two is very uncertain, though

¹⁴ Whether the Lille fragments of Stesichorus' *Thebaid* (*PMGF* 222(b)) provide evidence of early colometry depends on the date of the papyrus.

¹⁵ Dr ii. 31. 10 ff. οἱ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ ἐπινικον αὐτὸν εἶναί φασι, Τίμαιος δὲ θυσιαστικὴν, Καλλίμαχος (fr. 450 Pf.) Νεμεακὴν, Ἀμμώνιος καὶ Καλλίστρατος Ὀλυμπιακὴν, ἔνιοι Πυθικήν, ὡς Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ εἰδογράφος, ἔνιοι δὲ Παναθηναϊκὴν ('Some say that it is not an *Epinikion*, Timaeus says that it is a *Sacrificial*, Callimachus says that it is a *Nemean*, Ammonius and Callistratus that it is an *Olympian*, some that it is a *Pythian*, e.g. Apollonius the *eidoγράφος*, and some that it is a *Panathenaic*'). For another case of debate about the genre of a song see *POxy* 2368, cited at p. 97.

¹⁶ Heph. *Peri poemat.* 74. 12; 68. 16 ff.; see Pfeiffer (1968), 185.

¹⁷ In Π¹ D7 followed D6 (as in Π⁴), in Π²⁶ B3 followed B2 (again as in Π⁴). Note also that the dubious *παιάνες* S3-4 exhibit the same order in both Π²⁴ and Π⁷.

¹⁸ The three surviving orders are (1) that of *POxy* 2438: διθύραμβοι (2 books), προσόδια (2 books), παιάνες, παρθένεια (3 books), ἐπινίκια (4 books), ἐγκώμια, εὐ[.]κα[.] (2), ὕμνοι, ὑπορχήματα, θρήνοι, νεικολεῖων; (2) that of the *Vita Ambros.* (Dr i. 3. 6 ff.; a similar list in Eustathius, Dr iii. 303. 5 ff.): ὕμνοι, παιάνες, διθύραμβοι (2 books), προσόδια (2 books), παρθένεια (2 books), κεχωρισμένα παρθένεια, ὑπορχήματα (2 books), ἐγκώμια, θρήνοι, ἐπινίκια (4 books); (3) that of the *Suda* s.v. Πίνδαρος (iv. 133. 6 ff. Adler): Ὀλυμπιακά, Πυθιακά, προσόδια, παρθένεια, ἐνθρονισμοί, βακχικά,

the arrangement in the Ambrosian Life—in which genres directly concerned with religion come first and those relating to men come later—suggests the generic cartography of Proclus' *Chrestomathia*, and that in turn suggests Didymus.¹⁹ A variation in generic classification might be suggested by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem. lex.* 7 (1. 142 ff.), which could imply an alternative classification of A1 as a *Dithurambos* or *Huporkhema*, though that interpretation is not forced upon us by the passage. We find alternative readings, of course (explicit variations between papyri can be supplemented with evidence from *διόρθωσις*); most significant, perhaps, is evidence for two different recensions of the penultimate period of the epode of D6, differing in length by one syllable. Colometry also displays a few small variations (interesting since Hephaestion's reference to alternative editions of Anacreon and Alcaeus comes in the context of colometry). Colometric discrepancies between Π⁴ and Π⁷ in the third triad of D6 may reflect not variations between different editions, but variations within the same edition between the transmission of that section of text in the *Paianes* (Π⁴) and the *Prosodia* (Π⁷).²⁰

If we are going to entertain the hypothesis that there were alternative editions, there are two possibilities. I assume that a Hellenistic edition associated with the name of Aristophanes of Byzantium was one of them. A second edition could be by an earlier scholar, such as Callimachus, though if he had edited Pindar we should expect to hear more about it. The second possibility—the likelier of the two—is that the second edition was by a later editor such as Didymus working on the basis of the Aristophanic edition and refining it.

δαφνηφορικά, παιᾶνες, ὑπορχήματα, ὕμνοι, διθύραμβοι, σκόλια, ἐγκώμια, θρήνοι, δράματα τραγικά, ἐπιγράμματα ἐπικά, καταλογάδην παραινέσεις (the last two categories may have been added as a substitute for the loss of *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*). The *Suda*'s arrangement is similar to that implied at Hor. *Odes*, 4. 2.

¹⁹ See Cazzaniga (1970); Freis (1983) (unaware of *POxy* 2438?); Race (1987); Gallo (1968).

²⁰ The more significant variations are between Π⁴ and Π⁵ at D6. 125 and 137, and between Π⁴ and Π⁷ at D6. 128–31 and 134–7. See the discussions of Radt (1958), 11–12, and D'Alessio (1997). Other minor variations of colometry within Π⁴ (e.g. D6. 71, 92–3) could indicate that the copyist was working with a selection of exemplars exhibiting varying colometries. For variations in the papyri of the *Dithuramboi* see van der Weiden (1991), 60–1.

(d) *Scholia*

Some papyri seem to have no scholia (e.g. Π⁷), but usually there are at least a few. These are of two types: short ones contributing textual *διόρθώσεις*, and longer ones contributing information. In Π⁴ the former type are written in capitals or semi-capitals, probably by more than one hand, some at least by the writer of the main text. As for the longer scholia, the hand of some is a regular semi-cursive, while others are in a more rapid cursive.²¹ In Π²⁶ all the scholia are in small cursive.²² It is possible that the source for the longer scholia was a sort of meta-*ὑπόμνημα*, perhaps a collection of earlier *ὑπομνήματα* assembled by Didymus and epitomized by Theon.²³ The broad margins of papyri like Π⁴ and Π²⁶ may have been designed to accommodate excerpts from such a commentary.²⁴

We can reconstruct some part of the history of the text from abbreviations used in the papyri. In Π⁴ there are clear references to comments by Chrysippus of Soloi (third century BC), Theon of Alexandria (first century AD), and Nicanor of Alexandria (second century AD).²⁵ *Ἀρνι*(and *Ἀνι*(probably stand for Aristonicus of Alexandria (first century AD).²⁶ *Ἀρισ*(and *Ἀρ*(could be any of a wide range of grammarians: Aristophanes himself, Aristarchus of Samothrace (second century BC), Aristodemus of Alexandria (second century BC), or Aristonicus.²⁷ The abbreviation ζη- used to

²¹ *διόρθώσεις*: GH 15–16 distinguish three hands: H₁, H₂, and H₃. I use the sigla δ1, δ2, δ3. H₁/δ1 is the hand of the scribe; this is particularly clear in sections C and D, where the elaborate capitals of the text are reflected in some of the Σ to A1, A2, B2, and B3. Exegetical scholia: for the two forms GH use the sigla S₁ and S₂, the first perhaps by the same writer as H₁/δ2; for these I use the sigla ε1, ε2. For the symbols see also pp. 186–7.

²² POxy xxvi. 31.

²³ McNamee (1977), 287; on *ὑπομνήματα* on Pindar's works see del Fabbro (1979), 129; cf. F4. Radt (1958), 7, proposes that the intermediary was a codex.

²⁴ N. G. Wilson (1967); Laum (1928), 33 ff. 58, also argues that scholia are contemporary with the text.

²⁵ Nicanor: on D2. 75 and D6. 121; both identifications are due to McNamee (1977), 60 (in the first editors previously read *ανι*, for Aristophanes, in the second they read *γρ(ἀφεται)*). Chrysippus: at B2. 1 (McNamee (1977), 87). Theon: at D2. 37 (McNamee (1977), 63; fr. 37 Guhl).

²⁶ McNamee (1977), 71 ff. GH had suggested Aristophanes of Byzantium, reading *Ἀρνι*(and *Ἀρ*(. McNamee's opinion is based on phonetic considerations, and also on the grounds that authorities of the Roman period tend to get mentioned more frequently. The abbreviation comes up twice in D6 (89, 181); perhaps also in B4.

²⁷ *Ἀρισ*(at A3. 9; *Ἀρι*[(at A2. 6; *Ἀρ*(at D2. 61 γ· *Ἀρ*(; also οὕτως *Α*[(at B3. 32; see McNamee (1977), 77; Radt (1958), 9. Aristodemus, who was responsible for a famous Σ on *Nem.* 7. 102, Dr iii. 137. 3 ff. (see D6 n. 64), was a pupil of Aristarchus and author of a *Περὶ Πινδαρίου* in at least three books: see Deas (1931), 16.

be thought to refer to Zenodotus, but it is now believed to stand for *ζητείται*.²⁸ In addition, Π²⁶ contains a reference to Didymus.²⁹ It should probably be assumed that all these scholars wrote commentaries on the text. What stands out is that earlier generations of scholars are mentioned less often than later ones.

The scholia are often valuable, especially where the text they refer to does not survive, but it must be said that where both text and scholion survive the latter sometimes appears to be superfluous, e.g. the note on *χαλκοπύλω* at D6. 7 (the tradition that the Kephisos was supposed to flow into Kastalia is probably irrelevant),³⁰ or erroneous, e.g. the note on D2. 55 ff. (the text means 'a man must give his ancestors their due share in profound glory', not '... his own glorious life', which is how the scholion seems to take it) or on D4. 13 (the commentator says that Karthaia belongs to the Ceian *πεντάπολις*, whereas all other sources agree that it was a *τετράπολις*).³¹

(e) Titles

Titles are a special type of scholion.³² These are written in the margin in some papyri but in the text in others.³³ It would seem safe to argue that the papyri in which they are written in the margin are the earlier, and it may be that in the earliest editions they did not appear in the papyrus at all. However, some at least probably go back to the Hellenistic edition; proof of this is that in the London papyrus of Bacchylides the titles are written in the margin and yet the songs are ordered alphabetically by title: the choice of title must have preceded the arrangement.³⁴ Furthermore, in view of the fact that the superscriptions and subscriptions that accompany

²⁸ McNamee (1977), 124 ff.; also Lobel (1961), 42; Ferrari (1992d).

²⁹ McNamee (1977), 75 ff.; Π²⁶ fr. 97, at G8. 14.

³⁰ This tradition was mentioned by Alcaeus, 307cV (with apparatus); see Page (1953), 245 ff.

³¹ All other sources say that there were four cities on Ceos. Perhaps there was confusion with Arsinoe, the foundation of Ptolemy Philadelphus, which has generally been identified with Koressus (see L. Robert (1960), 144–56), or the settlement at Hagia Eirene may have counted as a separate city; see the discussions of Huxley (1965), 242 n. 51, and Hope (1986), 36. On the untrustworthiness of Pindaric scholia see Fränkel (1961); Lefkowitz (1975); (1985). A scholiast's misinterpretation of a fragment of Alcman is exposed by Most (1987).

³² On titles see Turner (1987), 13–14; Braswell (1988), 55–6, Nachmanson (1941), 36–49.

³³ In the margin in Π⁴, Π¹¹, Π²⁹; in the text in Π³, Π²⁶, Π²⁸, Π⁴⁵. No titles survive in Π⁷.

³⁴ BM inv. 733. Ode 15 (*Dith. I*) *Ἀντηγορίδαι ἢ Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* ('*Antenoridai* or the *Reclamation of Helen*'); Ode 16 (*Dith. II*) *Ἡρακλῆς εἰς Δελφούς* ('*Heracles, for*

some of the surviving *παιᾶνες* on stone contain the same sort of information that we find in the papyrus titles, there would seem to be a possibility that some of the latter preserve fifth-century dedicatory inscriptions.

The titles of *Dithuramboi* were one-word descriptions of the mythological subject-matter.³⁵ But in the case of most genres, such as *Epinikia* and *Paianes*, titles contain specific information about the performers, the dedicatees or the place of performance, and, because they contain concrete information, they can occasionally be wrong.³⁶ The usual form of the title found in *Paianes* specifies the performers or commissioners in the dative and the place of performance in the accusative. There is no specification of the genre. Examples are:

Δελφοῖς εἰς Πυθῶ: D6, beginning

Ἀνδρίοις εἰς Πυθῶ: Simonides, *PMG* 519, fr. 35. 12

There were variations on this pattern: the title at D6. 123 (*Αἰγινήταις εἰς Αἰακὸν προσόδιον*) is unusual because it comes in the middle of a poem; it specifies performers, dedicatee (following the model of titles in *Prosodia*?), and genre (the last presumably because this is not a *Paeon*); the title of D7 seems to have had a slightly expanded form with a second line, perhaps containing additional information about the ritual context or the genre; if line 5 of *Pa.* VIIb(a) (here G6–7) is a title, it was an unusual one in so far as it contained a specification of genre:]ΠΑΙΑΝ ΕΙΣ[. The problem is not only the variation in form, but also the superfluity of referring to a song as a *παιάν* in an edition of *Paianes*. This factor might lead one to doubt whether the fragment is from the *Paian*-book at all and not rather from some context in which it would have been necessary to identify the genre of the song, such as an anthology. However, reference

Delphi?); Ode 17 (*Dith.* III) *Ἥθῃοι ἢ Θησεύς* ('Bachelors or Theseus'); Ode 18 (*Dith.* IV) *Θησεύς*; Ode 19 (*Dith.* V) *Ἰώ*; Ode 20 (*Dith.* VI) *Ἰδας*; fr. 61 *Λευκίπιδες* (*Dith.* VII?; but cf. p. 71 n. 8). These titles are added in a hand (known as A') distinct from that of the text.

³⁵ Titles of Pindaric *Dithuramboi*: van der Weiden (1991), 61–2; Ferrari (1991b), 3ff.

³⁶ For example, Merkelbach (1973a) has argued that the transmitted title of Bacch. 11 is erroneous. Also Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 10 (Dr ii. 242. 2) *δοκεῖ δὲ μὴ ὕγιως ἐπιγεγράφθαι ἢ ὥσθ' Ἰπποκλεί. δέον γὰρ Ἰπποκλέα· τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα ἦν Ἰπποκλέας, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πίνδαρος δηλοῖ* ('The poem is not rightly entitled "To Hippocles", for it ought to be "To Hippocleas", for the name was Hippocleas, as Pindar himself shows').

to genre in a title would not necessarily have been superfluous in a book of *Paianes*, if it was part of a more complex title. Two scenarios might explain the presence of the latter. First, uncertainty might have been felt about the genre. There are, as we have seen (§9), a number of cases in which ancient authorities show uncertainty about whether or not a song was a *παῖάν*. In such cases a scrupulous editor might have given a song a title of the form *προσόδιον ἢ]παῖάν εἰς [Δία*. There is an alternative solution. There was a general awareness in antiquity that there were special forms of *παῖάν*: for example, we hear of the *ἐπινίκιος παῖάν* ('victory *παῖάν*'), and also the *προσοδιακὸς παῖάν* ('processional *παῖάν*' or 'a *παῖάν* with some properties of a *προσόδιον*').³⁷ I would suggest, then, that]ΠΑΙΑΝ ΕΙΣ[in G6–7 is part of a complex title either specifying a particular type of *παῖάν* or expressing uncertainty about the genre.

15. HELLENISTIC EIDOGRAPHY

No aspect of ancient editorial practice is more important than eidography. Earlier on, in §9, I examined cases of eidographic indeterminacy, and this enquiry occasioned a selective survey of the relevant generic sources. In this section I want to work towards an understanding of the eidographic policy employed by the editor(s) responsible for the selection of *Paianes* that has come down to us.

More than 200 songs by Pindar must have been known to Hellenistic editors, of which perhaps about 100 belonged to the *εἰς θεούς* categories. As far as we know, no generic classification was imposed on them until the early Hellenistic period, when about fifteen were grouped as *Paianes*.¹ One might wonder whether the need to fit the songs into book-rolls of roughly standard length is likely to have played a part in the process, but, to judge from the varying lengths of the four books of the *Epinikia*, it seems more likely that the number of examples of a given genre determined the length of the roll.²

The Hellenistic classification is likely to have been systematic in that to qualify as a *Paian* a song had to meet consistent crite-

³⁷ On these see pp. 45, 106.

¹ Late testimony to the effect that Pindar himself divided his songs into books on the basis of genre (F11 = Serv. *Aen.* 10. 738, ii. 464. 2 Hugen-Thilo); Quint. *Or.* 8. 6. 71) was rejected as early as Boeckh (1811–19), vol. ii, p. xxxi.

² For the lengths of the books of *Epinikia* see §13 n. 20.

ria. Clues as to what these criteria may have been are provided by some of the principal formulations concerning the genre made in poetic and eidographic sources. I have already mentioned the majority of these. Pindar himself in *Thr.* III (fr. 128c) defined the *παιάν* as Apollo's genre. Callimachus held that the word *ῆ* was its primary sign, according to *POxy* 2368. Still later, Plutarch in his comparison of the *παιάν* and the *διθύραμβος* characterizes the former as orderly and temperate. Athenaeus in his discussion of the Hermias-song implies that its key elements were τὸ παιανικὸν *ἰδίωμα* and/or the refrain (the term *ἰδίωμα* usually refers to style, but the context here suggests that it means the genre's thematic and functional association with the world of the living rather than the world of the dead). Proclus and some other later eidographic sources say that while the addressee of the *παιάν* varies, it is always apotropaic in function; other late eidographic sources specify a combination of apotropaic function with Apolline addressee. Servius (*F11*) says that the *παιᾶνες* were songs in honour of both men and gods, and that Pindar followed this model. Late lexicographical sources (Hesychius, the *Suda*) gloss the word *παιᾶνες* as *κώμους* and *εὐφημίας*, i.e. songs of celebration and ritually correct utterance. Finally, the military functions (performance before or after battle) are given primary importance by other late sources.³

Some of these formulations are unlikely to have played a part in the selection of the *Paianes*. The stress on apotropaic function in Proclus and the late lexicographical sources cannot reflect Hellenistic eidographic policy, since of the *Paianes* in Π⁴ only one, A1, shows sign of being apotropaic. The emphasis on military function is inappropriate for the same reason. The view of Hesychius or the *Suda* that the *παιάν* is essentially a song of celebration seems too general and vague to be of much use in Hellenistic eidography, as does Plutarch's view that the genre's defining quality is temperateness and orderliness.

A more promising candidate is the refrain or generic signature. This is not mentioned in later eidographic sources, but Callimachus, our closest authority for Hellenistic practice, focused on

³ Pind. *Thr.* III: pp. 23–4. Callimachus: pp. 97–9. Plutarch: pp. 82–3. Athenaeus: pp. 94–5. Proclus: pp. 101–6. Apotropaic function and dedication to Apollo: ΣAr. *Plout.* 636, iv/1. 214 Dindorf; ΣPlato, *Symp.* 177 A; ΣEur. *Pho.* 1102; Joh. Sard. on Aphth. *Progymn.* 8, 120, 3 ff. Rabe. Servius: pp. 362–3. *εὐφημίας καὶ κώμους*: Hesych. iii. 253 Schmidt; *Suda*, iv. 73 Adler. Military functions: ΣThuc. 4. 43. Many of these eidographic sources are conveniently available in Färber (1936), ii. 31 ff.

the element $\dot{\iota}\eta$, which could be part of a refrain. And the refrain is also one of two features mentioned by Athenaeus in his discussion of the Hermias-song. The hypothesis that the generic signature was important in Hellenistic eidography is borne out by the fact that most of the Pindaric *Paianes* in Π^4 show regular refrains (D2, D4, and D5), quasi-refrains (D6 and D1), or other generic signatures (C2. 4; D2. 4; D6. 127; D7. 9). Some songs show no sign of any form of generic signature, but in each case large sections are lost, and there may have been generic signatures in the lacunae.

Even if not all of the songs classed as *Paianes* in the Hellenistic edition had signatures, most of them probably did. One might wonder whether a song with a paeanic generic signature was automatically classed as a *Paian*. That seems not to be the policy employed by Aristarchus in the dispute reported in *POxy* 2368. And another counter-example may be Pindar, S2, which has a refrain starting with the element $\dot{\iota}\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon$ but is dedicated to a goddess called 'queen of the Olympians'; we cannot be sure about its classification, but a *Paian* is not the only possibility, nor the likeliest.

Another factor that may have played a part in Hellenistic eidographic practice is the $\piαιανικὸν \dot{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\mu\alpha$ mentioned by Athenaeus. I suggested earlier that this term amounts to 'themes or functions relating to celebration, healing, and the Olympian sphere'. Somewhat comparable are the statements of lexicographers who define the genre as songs of celebration and ritually correct utterance, and also Plutarch's representation of the $\piαιάν$ as orderly and temperate. Compare my analysis of the significance of the $\piαιάν$ in its generic and social context (§8). Performance scenario may also have been part of this functional or thematic criterion: for example, there may have been a tendency to classify songs showing signs of performance at the major Delphic festivals as *Paianes*, whatever their other characteristics, in view of the $\piαιάν$'s close association with Delphi.

We can only guess what sort of functional or thematic factors would have engaged the attention of the eidographers. I would suggest that it was not a narrow criterion focusing on a single function, as in Proclus' formulation, but a complex one covering many of the functions and performance scenarios associated with the genre. The requirement of $\piαιανικὸν \dot{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\mu\alpha$ would have been satisfied if a song gave signs of performance at a major Apolline centre (B2, C2,

D4-6), or of having an apotropaic function (A1), or of celebrating a military victory (D2), and no doubt in many other ways also.

Another property which could have been an eidographic criterion is an Apolline theme. This possibility seems appealing, because most of the songs preserved in Π⁺ have some link with Apollo. However, the significance of this deity to the eidographers is debatable. First, he is certainly not confined to the *Paian*, since the ancient edition contained at least one *Hymnos* to Apollo.⁴ Second, some of the Pindaric *Paianes* may have been dedicated to other gods. The principal addressee of D2 seems to be the local hero Abderus, although Apollo has a role as well. Some have supposed on the basis of a testimonial fragment (F1) that one of the *Paianes* was dedicated to Zeus. Furthermore, there is a chance that S2, the song dedicated to the 'queen of the Olympians', was classed as a *Paian*. So perhaps Apolline theme/Apollo as addressee was not a *sine qua non*, though it may have had an important role.

Mention should also be made in this context of the testimony of Servius, who says that the *παιάν* 'contains the praises of men and gods', asserting that this was the model of the genre followed by Pindar (F11). This claim looks implausible: the only Pindaric *Paian* dedicated to a hero is D2, so perhaps Servius is mistaken, and somewhere along the line the information that Hellenistic generic innovation sanctioned the dedication of *παῖνες* to men as well as to gods has been conflated with the fact that the most celebrated instances of the genre were those of Pindar. On the other hand, Servius may be thinking of Pindaric *Paianes* which include myths relating the exploits of men and heroes, such as D2 and D4-7. In that case, his testimony may provide insight into Hellenistic eidography.

While formal and functional criteria could have qualified a song as a *Paian* in Hellenistic eidography, other factors may have excluded it. We saw in §9 that generic ambiguity arose in the case of a song which contained a small refrain or quasi-refrain or a generic signature that suggested that it might be a *παιάν*, and a non-aetiological narrative, which pointed towards a *διθύραμβος*. The song referred to in POxy 2368 was clearly such a case; also perhaps

⁴ For the *Hymnos* in Hellenistic eidography see Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a18ff., cited in §9 n. 39. Pindar's *Hymnos* to Apollo: ΣPaus. 9. 23. 6 (iii. 222. 18 Spiro), referring to fr. 51c, implies that in one of the *Hymnoi* Apollo was represented as the father of Ptoius.

Bacchylides 17, which was classed as a *Dithurambos* by Hellenistic editors, presumably because it is dominated by a narrative concerning Theseus, though other features suggest a *παϊάν*. Hence, we may infer that Hellenistic editors worked on the principle that if a song was dominated by narrative, it ought to be classified as a *Dithurambos*, a principle which in my judgement was unreliable. Similarly, in so far as *μίμησις*, the complement of narrative, was specially associated with the *Huporkhema*, it seems likely that a song in which *μίμησις* was prominent would tend to be classified as a *Huporkhema*. A mimetic quality would not, I suggest, rule out classification as a *Paian*, as long as it was not perceived as a dominating characteristic. This distinction would be congruent with the perception of mimetic dance as excited, contrasting with the calm *παϊάν*.⁵

Manner of performance otherwise seems to be an unimportant factor. For example, it does not make any difference whether or not the *χορός* were processing; a sacred song performed in procession would probably normally have been classed as a *Prosodion* (making the reasonable assumption that performance in procession was the primary sign of this genre for the eidographers), but since some *χοροί* in the *Paianes* clearly process, it seems that other factors could override this criterion.⁶ What about identity of performers? This was a factor at least in the case of the classification of the *Partheneion*, by definition a song performed by *παρθένοι*. If (hypothetically) a song resembled a *παϊάν* in some respect, but gave evidence of having been performed by a *χορός* of *παρθένοι* (cf. Eur. *Her.* 687 ff.),⁷ it might have posed a problem for Hellenistic eidographers; we do not know how they would have handled such a case, but it is certainly possible that signs of performance by *παρθένοι* would have been another excluding factor.

I conclude my discussion of Hellenistic eidographic policy by asking how accurate it was, and how it relates to Pindaric prac-

⁵ Bacch. 17: pp. 98–9. *ὑπόρχημα*: pp. 99–101.

⁶ *προσόδιον* (often *προσῳδion* in late sources) as processional song: Proclus: §9 n. 39; also *EM* 690. 33 ff., and 41 ff.; 777. 4 ff.; London Σ on Dion. Thrax, 451. 17 ff. Hilgard; ΣAr. *Birds*, 853. Alternative analysis of *προσόδιον* as an ᾠδή accompanying (*πρός*) something: *EM* 690. 40 ff.; Joh. Sard. on Aphth. *Progymn.* 8, 120. 9 ff. Rabe. For procession in the performance of Pindaric *Paianes* see p. 175.

⁷ Delian *παρθένοι*: p. 29. *χοροί* of *παρθένοι* and Delphi: D2 pp. 273–4. Eur. *Her.* 687 ff. is cited on p. 114. For the *Partheneion* see Calame (1977a), and appropriate sections in Färber (1936), vol. ii.

tice. *Prima facie*, it seems that errors of several kinds might have occurred.

First, Pindar himself links the *παιάν* with Apollo and Artemis (*Thr.* III = fr. 128c). But if after all he composed *παιάνες* to deities other than Apollo, and if Apolline theme was after all a criterion in Hellenistic eidographic policy, then such *παιάνες* would have been misclassified somewhere else in the Hellenistic edition: as *Hymnoi*, or as *Prosodia*, if the *χορός* seemed to be processing (like S2?). Equally, if after all there were Pindaric *παιάνες* in praise of living men or in commemoration of the dead, perhaps implying performance at *συμπόσια*, like Aristotle's Hermias-song, then Hellenistic eidographic policy may have classed these not as *Paianes*, but rather as *Enkomia* (the Hellenistic category which continues the earlier *σκόλιον*),⁸ or perhaps as *Threnoi*, if the subject was deceased. (It probably counts against the existence of such songs that there is no sign that any ancient scholar worried about whether some song classed as a *Threnos* or *Enkomion* might better be classified as a *Paian*, or vice versa.)

Even if this problem did not arise, because there were no Pindaric *παιάνες* to deities other than Apollo, or because Apolline theme was not a factor in Hellenistic eidographic policy, there were still two other ways in which misclassification may have come about. First, performance scenario is often crucial for the determination of genre, but eidographers may sometimes have ignored it in favour of formal or thematic features. For example, if some Pindaric *παιάν* possessed a large, non-aetiological narrative, it might have ended up being classed as a *Dithurambos* (like the song referred to in *POxy* 2368, or Bacchylides 17). Equally, a song originally performed as a *συμπόσιον-παιάν* might have been misclassified if the text did not contain a generic signature, or did not make the context clear.

Second, Hellenistic eidographic policy may have tended to exaggerate borderlines between genres, which were originally vague and approximate. This problem would be particularly acute in the case of a song which was intended to transgress generic conventions. For example, it is possible that in the fifth century BC S2 could have been described as either a *παιάν* or a *προσόδιον*. This ambivalence

⁸ For the *ἐγκώμιον* see p. 92. For *ἐγκώμιον* and *σκόλιον* see Körte (1918) (the title of Bacch. fr. *20-20E was *Enkomia* and not *Skolia*, as GH had originally supposed); van Groningen (1960), 11 ff. (the book of *Enkomia* in the Hellenistic edition of Pindar included a subsection of *Skolia*).

could be accidental, or it is possible that the song was intended to bridge categories. At any rate, such an example would pose a challenge for the Hellenistic eidographic framework.

The foregoing paragraphs present a worst-case scenario, based on miscellaneous problematic cases. It is worth remembering, however, that on present evidence, we have no specific reason to suppose that Hellenistic eidographic policy brought about the misclassification of a single Pindaric *παῖάν*, or (as I argued in §9) to doubt that Hellenistic classification to a very large extent continued a generic cartography which already existed in the fifth century BC.

16. ORGANIZATION OF THE ANCIENT EDITION

One of the chief problems that arises in attempting to reconstruct the ancient edition of the *Paianes* concerns the principle of order. Our information about the way ancient editions of the Greek lyric poets were organized is far from complete, but what we have suggests that the songs were usually organized along a definite plan. The principles of division most familiar to us are by metre, as in the case of the first seven books of Sappho, or by genre, as in the case of Pindar, Bacchylides, Simonides, and the eighth book of Sappho (*Epithalamia*). When there were enough examples of a particular genre to fill several books, it is reasonable to expect that a systematic subdivision will have been applied, as we can observe in the case of the *Epinikia* of Pindar.

Within a book the arrangement of songs seems to have generally followed two principles: (1) alphabetical order, whether of the first letters of the songs, as perhaps in the case of Sappho,¹ or of the titles given to them in the editions, as in the case of the *Dithuramboi* of Bacchylides, the alphabetical ordering extending no further than the first letter, as seems to be regularly the case in the Hel-

¹ See Lobel (1925), p. xv. There are two sorts of evidence: (1) in some cases several consecutive songs in the papyri seem to have started with the same letter, and (2) the lines that Hephaestion cites to illustrate the metres of the songs—which we imagine generally came from near the beginning of their respective books—always seem to start with letters near the start of the alphabet. There would seem to be an obstacle to this theory in the first song of bk. 1, beginning *ποικιλόθρον'*, but perhaps there were special reasons for putting this song first. For the suggestion that the organization of the songs of Alcaeus within the book was also alphabetical see Gallavotti (1942) 165, cited in Daly (1967), 23 n. 3. The arrangement of epigrams in the Greek anthology is in part alphabetical: see Cameron (1993), 19ff.

lenistic period;² (2) progression from more important subjects to less important, as in the case of the *Epinikia* of Pindar, where the order seems to be determined for the most part by the status of the athletic event and, after that, the status of the victor.³ Miscellaneous songs are put at the end of books, e.g. the three *κεχωρισμένα* songs at the end of the *Nemeans* and the *ᾠσχοφορικὸν μέλος* that probably came at the end of the *Isthmians*.⁴ The arrangement of the single book of Bacchylides' *Epinikia* was probably similar.⁵ The beginnings and ends of books seem to have come in for special treatment, for just as miscellaneous songs tend to be placed last, so the first place seems to be reserved for those that were regarded as of special importance.⁶ This is perhaps the only respect in which editors of the classical Greek lyric poets seem to have approached formal/aesthetic principles of organization of the type we associate with Hellenistic poetry books.⁷

On the basis of this, what conclusions are we led to with respect to the arrangement of the *Paian*-book? There are no signs of ordering by metre. Nor are there indications of alphabetical ordering: the songs are certainly not organized alphabetically by first letter of the text, and we can also exclude the possibility of alphabetical ordering by information contained in the titles—the nationalities of the performers and the places of performance.⁸

² Daly (1967), 29; Rusten (1982), 363.

³ See Irigoin (1952), 43–4.

⁴ For the *κεχωρισμένα* *Nemeans* see the introductory Σ to *Nem.* 9 (Dr iii. 150. 3). For the *ᾠσχοφορικὸν μέλος* see Rutherford and Irvine (1988).

⁵ Maehler (1982–97), i/1. 36ff. It started with two songs dedicated to a Ceian victor, this arrangement presumably being preferred because Bacchylides was a Ceian poet. After that there was a sequence of three *Epinikia* dedicated to Hieron, then two for Lachon of Ceos for a victory at Olympia and a third for another Ceian victor, Liparion, then five for victories at the Isthmian, Pythian, and Nemean games. It finished with two fairly obscure songs: an *Epinikion* for Cleoptolemus of Thessaly at the Petraia (it is presumably the obscurity of this festival which warranted its late position), and an installation song for Aristoteles of Larissa, comparable to Pind. *Nem.* 11 (see Maehler (1982–97), i/2. 302ff.).

⁶ e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 1, which, being in honour of a victory in the horse race, should have come after *Ol.* 2–4, which are in honour of victories in the chariot race. Other examples might be the Ceian songs at the start of Bacchylides' *Epinikia*, and the cletic hymn to Aphrodite at the start of the first book of Sappho.

⁷ The aesthetic organization of Hellenistic poetry books is discussed by van Sickle (1980). The arrangement of the first seven songs in the book of Bacchylides' *Epinikia*—two Ceian songs followed by three for Hieron, followed by two more Ceian songs—looks particularly 'aesthetic' in character.

⁸ There cannot be an alphabetical order based on first letter because D7, beginning with μ, followed D6, beginning with π. There is no alphabetical order based on performers because D4 (*Κεῖσι*) precedes D7 (*Θηβαῖοι*), nor one based on place because

In the absence of any obvious solution, I offer the following hypothesis, which, though not providing a full account of how the *Paianes* might have been arranged, at least represents a partial solution to the problem. I begin with the observation that Apollo's lack of prominence is particularly noticeable in the songs from section A of the papyrus (my Group D). None of the songs in this section can be shown to have related one of the standard Apolline myths—his birth, his journey to the Hyperboreans, his taking over Delphi, and his fight with the Delphic dragon. The nearest approach to this is in the introduction to D₃, which seems to have contained a description of an epiphany of Apollo. Given that D₆ was composed for the Delphic Theoxenia, one would expect Apollo to be prominent, but his role in the narration of the career of Achilles and Neoptolemus in the second triad is not particularly conspicuous. Apollo hardly seems to figure at all in D₂ or D₄. It must be acknowledged that this is to some extent an argument *ex silentio*, since there are large lacunae even in section A of *POxy* 841, but I believe that this is still a remarkable distribution. The surviving (or partially surviving) *Paianes* in which Apolline mythology had a higher profile seem to have come earlier in the book. Thus, C₂, which relates the birth of Apollo, came in section B; A₂, which has been plausibly connected with the Delphic Septerion, comes from section D; the narrative of the four Delphic temples related in B₂ does not seem to stress Apollo's role to any degree, but in so far as it relates the origin of the Delphic oracle, it seems a very suitable theme for a *παῖάν*.

Given these data, my hypothesis is that the *Paianes* in which mythology relating to Apollo or the major cults of the god was prominent were placed earlier in the book. This may have been part of a more general policy of putting those songs that were judged to be better instances of the genre first; in virtue of Apollo's special link with the genre, this group would include those *Paianes* in which mythology relating to Apollo or his major cults was prominent, although it might have included other songs also.

The second half of the book may have contained songs that were judged not to be specially Apolline, or not to be such good examples

A₁ (Thebes, from section D) will have preceded songs performed at Delos and Delphi in sections C, B, and A. It is remarkable that the songs in section A seem to be roughly in alphabetical order with respect to place of performance: D₂ Abdera; D₃–6 Delos and Delphi; D₇ Thebes. These data would be compatible with the hypothesis that the songs in section A constitute a separate group.

of the genre. One further possibility worth considering is that the second half contained *Paianes* that seemed to focus on heroes and men, as in D2 and D4–7. One thinks of the testimony of Servius (cf. F11), that the book of *Paianes* ‘contained the praises of both gods and men’; is it possible that this statement accurately reflects knowledge of the organization of the book?

Two possible counter-examples to this scenario deserve to be mentioned. First, A1, from section D, seems to count against the hypothesis since the theme does not seem particularly Apolline: the first triad is a prayer on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun, asking what it portends and praying that the worst effects should be averted; and the second triad seems to describe the birth of the Theban prophet Tenerus, son of Apollo and Melia. This does not look strongly Apolline, but we should bear in mind that from the fifth century BC there was a tendency to identify Apollo with the sun; and this view was perhaps held by the editor who placed A1 early in the book. Alternatively, it may have been interpreted as an apotropaic *παῖάν* and, for all we know, the practice may have been to group apotropaic *παῖνες* earlier than non-apotropaic cult *παῖνες*.⁹ The other possible counter-example is B3. We have only sixteen lines, which comprise a mythological narrative: someone, presumably Cassandra, reports that Hecabe had a dream in which she saw a hundred-handed monster, which is presumably meant to represent Paris. This does not look like an Apolline *παῖάν*, but if we had the opening nine lines or the section following line 25 (which may have been very large), we might get a completely different impression. For example, the song might well have gone on to describe the relationship between Cassandra and Apollo; and perhaps a full specification of a cultic context was contained in the closing lines.

Sections D, C, B, and A amount to at least and probably well over 800 lines, which represents at most half the book.¹⁰ If the average length of *Paianes* was 100 lines, there were probably between 15 and

⁹ It might be thought to support this that in generic descriptions of Hellenistic origin (Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a5; ΣDion. Thrax 451.12–13 Hilgard) the apotropaic *παῖάν* comes before other types. Perhaps the term *προσοδιακὸς παῖάν*, used of a *παῖάν* of Pindar—probably D4—by ΣPind. *Isth.* 1 (pp. 106, 284), is a Hellenistic term for non-apotropaic and purely cult *παῖνες*.

¹⁰ D (*Pa.* IX–X) at least 71 lines, C (*Pa.* VIII–VIIIa) at least 136 lines, B (*Pa.* VIIa–VIIb) at least 63 lines, A (*Pa.* I–VII) at least 530 lines, yielding a total of no fewer than and probably well over 800 lines.

20 of them in the whole book. This means that besides those we can reconstruct in whole or part on the basis of Π^4 and other papyri (A1-3, B1-3, C1-2, D1-7), there may have been a number of others. Miscellaneous fragments of Π^4 presumably belong to some of these, fragments of other papyri may contribute to others (cf. my Group E). Other lost *Paianes* may be represented by testimonial fragments. Three that may have contributed to the 'Apolline' section are:

F9. According to pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica*, Pindar said in one of his *Paianes* that the Lydian ἀρμονία was first taught to men at the wedding of Niobe. This may well indicate that the story of Niobe and the destruction of the Niobids by Apollo and Artemis was the theme of one of the *Paianes* grouped earlier in the book.

H2. A scholion on Aeschylus tells us that according to Pindar, Ge attempted to send Apollo to Tartarus because he tried to take over Delphi. This is not said to be from a *Paian*, but it would suit a Delphic *Paian* very well.

H1. Strabo and Pausanias attribute to Pindar the myth of how Delphi was founded at the meeting-point of two eagles sent by Zeus, one from the east and one from the west. Again, we lack explicit testimony that this myth was related in a *Paian*, but it is easy to see that it would be admirably suited to a Delphic *Paian*.¹¹

17. DUBIOUS PAIANES

Some fragments of Π^{26} , Π^{28} , and Π^{45} can be shown to belong to songs that were contained in Π^4 , and therefore to come from *Paianes*. A few fragments of Π^7 could either come from the *Paianes* (*Paian* 6) or from the *Prosodia*. In other cases the generic provenance of fragments of these papyri is uncertain, and some of them are unlikely to come from *Paianes*. The same alternatives arise for papyri that have no overlaps with Π^4 , but which overlap with one of the papyri that contributed to it (Π^8 and Π^{29} with Π^7 , and Π^{11} with Π^{26}).

I have collected in Group G those fragments that look as if they could belong to *Paianes*. Formal features are rarely a criterion; an exception is the trace of a παῖάν-cry in G6, from Π^{45} . Usually the criterion is content, as in the case of the three most significant fragments: G1, a large fragment of Π^7 describing the birth of

¹¹ For an alternative theory about the organization of the book see now D'Alessio (1997), 30-1.

Apollo, G8, a fragment of Π^{11} overlapping with Π^{26} , describing the foundation by Heracles of a cult of Apollo on Paros, and G9, also from Π^{11} , describing a musical innovation involving a *παίδων* made by Xenocritus of Locri. As well as fragments of the papyri mentioned, I have also grouped in G two fragments of a further papyrus, Π^{34} , which has no overlaps with either Π^4 or any of the papyri with a demonstrable connection to Π^4 , on grounds of content: in one of these (my G11) a singer seems to refer to living in Delphi, which might suit a *παίδων*, and in the other (my G10) there is a reference to Apollo, which would be consistent with the hypothesis. The extensive use I have made here of the argument 'If a fragment relates to Apollo or Apolline themes, it is likely to be from a song classified as a *Paian*' is open to the objection that some songs in honour of Apollo were probably included in other books also: the *Humnoi*, the *Prosodia*, and, most of all, the *Huporkhemata*. On this basis, I would have to acknowledge the low probability that all of my assignments to Group G are correct. But this is balanced by a more reasonable probability that any particular one of these fragments may be from a *Paian* and quite a high probability (I would claim) that at least some of them are.

Other fragments of these papyri (including Π^{34}) I have divided between two supplements. In the first ('S') I group the more substantial fragments that lack features of form and content indicative of *Paianes*; the second supplement ('Z') is a default category for the smaller fragments whose provenance there is no reasonable chance of establishing. Snell originally classed many of these fragments as *Paianes*, though in the more recent editions doubt is expressed by the use of a prefixed asterisk (e.g. **Pa.* XV).

In the case of the more substantial fragments, one might think that it would sometimes be possible to establish the genre of the songs to which they belong, but informed conjecture is as far as we can go. The lack of success is due partly to the high level of our ignorance about what sorts of songs were grouped in genre-books other than *Epinikia* and *Paianes*,¹ partly to the fact that the criteria for the other religious genres may not always have been as distinctive and immediately recognizable as those which characterize *Paianes*.

The first guess I have to offer concerns those fragments in the first supplement which are contributed by or can be associated with

¹ I have already collected many of the relevant data in §§9 and 16.

Π⁷. This was a much less elaborate copy than Π⁴, written in a cruder, semi-cursive hand, without scholia, and with titles in column. The one thing we know for certain is that its contents included either *Paianes* or *Prosodia* (and perhaps both); we infer that because it included the third triad of D6, which we now know appeared in the *Prosodia* as well. Its most conspicuous contribution is G₁, which looks like part of a *Paian*. More problematic are S₁–5. The text for S₁–2 is a single fragment of Π²⁶, but there is an overlap with Π⁷; S₁ describes the birth of Heracles, S₂ is from a song with a distinctive refrain in honour of a goddess. S₃–4 are preserved by a single fragment of Π²⁹, again overlapping with a fragment of Π⁷; S₃ is the end of a song which seems to have had something to do with a heroic cult, S₄ is the start of a song which, to judge from the title at least, was sung by the Aeginetans in honour of Aiaikos. S₅ comprises several fragments of Π⁸, which has an overlap with Π⁷. To begin with, whereas references to cult in general would be compatible with any of the genres *εἰς θεούς*, the emphasis on heroic cult in S₁ would seem to rule out at least the *Hymnos*, from which songs in honour of heroes were surely excluded. It is also worth observing that the form of the title of S₄, which makes no reference to subject-matter, would seem to rule out the *Dithurambos*. The range of genres available would still be embarrassingly wide, were it not for features contained in two of the fragments that suggest *Prosodia*. First, S₄ seems to describe the ritual enactment of a myth which could have taken the form of a procession; second, S₂ may have a monostrophic structure, and that too would suit a procession.² To sum up: the most economical way of accounting for Π⁷ is the hypothesis that it contained *Prosodia*; but we cannot rule out alternatives, especially the possibility that it contained *Paianes* and *Prosodia*.³

All the remaining fragments that I have grouped in the first supplement are contributed by Π²⁶. It is worth reviewing what we know about the contents of the roll or rolls denoted by this sign. It

² It is a natural assumption that the progressive structure of a monostrophic song would be suitable for performance in procession. Examples would include *Pyth.* 6 (with the discussion of Shapiro (1988)) and D₅ (*Pa.* V). Conversely, a triadic structure might be thought to support performance accompanied by dance, though in some cases triadic songs might have been performed in procession also (see pp. 266 ff.).

³ The hypothesis that Π⁷ contained just *Prosodia* has recently been argued by D'Alessio (1997).

is written in a rapid and distinctively sloping hand, with scholia and titles written in the column. Besides *Paianes*, it contained *Humnoi* (fr. 33b–d) and Pythian *Epinikia*. Since it contributes to S2, it may also have included *Prosodia*, if the suggestion that I made in the preceding paragraph is on the right lines (cf. also Z27). In addition, there are a number of fragments of Sappho from Oxyrhynchus in the same hand, published long before the rest of Π²⁶ as POxy 1787.⁴ In view of the wide range of its contents, Π²⁶ can hardly have been a single roll (even though the columns are unusually tall);⁵ it is more likely to have been a number of smaller rolls. One might think of an anthology (perhaps as a transitional stage in which songs from various genres might have been presented in an anthologized form), but for the fact that B2–3 are consecutive in both Π²⁶ and Π⁴, since the chances must be against two consecutive songs in the original editions both being selected for the anthology.

I have little progress to report in identifying the genres of the four substantial fragments of Π²⁶ that I have grouped in S (S6–9). The diversity of the contents of the papyrus only makes the task harder. S6 and S7 belong together: the first is a song-ending containing a reference to *παῖνες*, but we know from Bacchylides 17 that such a feature would not have obligated ancient editors to class the song as a *Paian*; S7 seems to be the beginning of a cult song performed at Argos, introducing a narrative of Electryon's raid on the Teleboai; presumably this comes from one of the genres *εἰς θεούς*, but there is no way of telling which. S8, a cult song which refers to Dodona, might be from the *Humnoi* or the *Prosodia*. The genre of the song to which S9 belonged remains a mystery.

⁴ Some fragments previously assigned to POxy 1787 were reassigned by Lobel (1961) to Π²⁶: POxy 1787 fr. 8–9 = Π²⁶ fr. 86–7 (Z23–4 and Z25 *Pa.* XXII(i) and (i); the latter contains the Aeolic form). Similarly, POxy 2445, the source of Pind. fr. 70d (*Dith.* IV), is in the same hand as POxy 1604, the source of Pind. *Dith.* I–III but also the same hand as POxy 1788 (Alcaeus). The important article of Funghi and Savorelli (1992) came to my attention too late to make use of its thesis about the relationship between POxy 2442 and other papyri of Pindar from Oxyrhynchus.

⁵ 39 lines or more: for the argument, see p. 250 n. 33, on C2. The columns of POxy 1788 (Alcaeus; by a hand very similar in style to Π²⁶ and POxy 1787) were at least 40 lines high (cf. fr. 4).

18. PINDAR'S ARTICULATION OF THE *παιών*

I have already surveyed the evidence for the genre as a whole. In this and the following sections I shall look at some aspects of Pindar's articulation of it. (The metre of the *Paianes* is set out in the Metrical Appendix.)

(a) Performance scenarios

The apotropaic function seems to be represented by A1; the pre-battle function, perhaps also the celebratory function, in part by D2. But of the various performance scenarios associated with the *παιών*, the only one that is consistently represented is worship of Apollo, sometimes coupled with other deities (Aphrodite at the start of D2, Aegina in D6. 127), sometimes with a hero. There is no sign of any Pindaric *Paian* to Asclepius, and the evidence of *Paianes* to other deities is doubtful: on the basis of a scholion on Sophocles (= F2), it has long been believed that one of the *Paianes* was in honour of the cult of Zeus at Dodona, and Snell–Maehler tentatively associate with this a fragment of Π²⁶ (fr. 59, here S8), which seems to relate to a Dodonean context, but I am not convinced that the evidence forces us in this direction. Other fragments in honour of other deities (S2, S4) need not be from *Paianes*. Nor is there any evidence of a Pindaric *Paian* dedicated exclusively to a hero or to a man, although heroes and men are quite often the theme. Two of the *Paianes* commemorate colonization: D2, which describes the consolidation of the Teian colony of Abdera in Thrace, and D5, which represents, or dramatizes, the Athenian colonization of the Cyclades. Heracles' conquest/colonization of Paros is the theme of G8, which may come from a *Paian*. In these cases there seems to be engagement with the idea of Apollo as a patron of colonization.¹

The only *Paianes* that seem to relate a major episode in the career of Apollo are C2 and G1, which both describe his birth. This is surprising, in view of the amount of material about Apollo in the Delphic *παιάνες* on stone and in the fragments of *Paianes* by Simonides. One of the reasons for the low profile of Apollo in the surviving fragments might be that (as I suggested in §16) section A of Π⁴, from which most of our fragments come, represents a

¹ Malkin (1987), *passim*; see p. 380 on G8. 58; compare the 'colonization of Delphi' in the last section of *HH Ap.*, lines 391 ff.

special group of *Paianes* in which Apolline myths were not well represented; the *Paianes* lost in the earlier sections of the papyrus might be the source for H2 (Apollo's take-over of Delphi opposed by Ge) or H1 (the eagles and the ὀμφαλός).

The shrines of Apollo represented in the fragments are panhellenic (Delphi), regional (Delos, Thebes, Ptoion), and local (Abdera; perhaps Ceos and Paros). We know of no Pindaric *Paianes* composed for Dorian festivals, though interest in the Cyrenean Karneia is indicated by *Pythian* 5. (Pindaric *Huporkhemata* composed for performance at Sparta are, however, attested.) Nor is there any trace of a *Paian* intended for the great centres of Apolline worship in Ionia.²

It seems likely that all cult *Paianes* were composed as the result of commission, either by local *poleis* sending pilgrims to a sanctuary, or by the sanctuaries themselves for performance there by local χοροί or display. In theory, Pindar might have composed without a commission, perhaps as the result of a dream or an oracle (cf. p. 145), but there is no evidence for this.

(b) Formal features

D5 shares with the Erythraean παιάν to Asclepius and Philodamus' παιάν to Dionysus a monostrophic structure with a fairly short stanza and conspicuous use of refrain. The other surviving Pindaric *Paianes* are triadic, like most classical choral lyric. The stanza length is greater than that of the παιᾶνες on stone—greater, in fact, than that of the Pindaric *Epinikia*.³ Whereas παιᾶνες on stone usually begin with a direct reference to Apollo or the deity invoked in the song, the introductions of Pindar's *Paianes* are less direct, starting with

² *Pyth.* 5: Krummen (1990), 139–40, who interprets the ode as at least in part a παιάν; Spartan ὑπόρχημα: p. 100. Ionia: contrast Sim. *PMG* 519, fr. 32; the absence of any reference to Apollo at Didyma is probably to be explained by the inactivity of Didyma after the suppression of the Ionian revolt in 494 BC: Fontenrose (1988), 12 ff.

³ If we compute stanza length in terms of number of *morae*, counting anceps as short, it turns out that in *Epinikia* the stanza rarely reaches 200 (e.g. *Ol.* 1 str. 196, ep. 174; *Pyth.* 4 str. 195, ep. 176; *Nem.* 3 str. 165, ep. 126); exceptions are the two monostrophic songs *Isth.* 8 (249) and *Ol.* 14 (239). Far fewer strophes from other genres survive more or less complete, but several of these have more than 250 *morae*: the strophe of *Dith.* II (fr. 70b) has 299 (is the length what is referred to by σχοινωτένεια τ' αἰοῖά ('stretched-out song (?)') at *Dith.* II (fr. 70b) 1?); the strophe of C2 had about 281; in D6 the strophe had 282 and the epode 265; G8 also had a very long stanza; and we can add Bacch. 17, the strophe and epode of which are much longer than those of any Bacchylidean *Epinikion*. Presumably this points to a generic difference. See also Hamilton (1990), 212.

a hero (D2), or seers (B2), or Delphi (D6). And Pindar's practice of ending with a prayer that the deity receive the singer (D5–6) is also unparalleled in the *παιᾶνες* on stone. Finally, Pindar's use of the refrain, though generally sparing, shows subtlety: for example, the refrain in D2, apart from its formal and generic-marking function within the song, also suggests battle; and the use of a quasi-refrain at D6. 121–2 may be intended as an allusion to the aetiology of the *παιᾶν*-cry.

The dialect of the *Paianes* is similar to what we find in Pindar's *Epinikia*, combining features that (at least from the point of view of the fifth century BC) belong to the Ionic, Aeolic, and Doric dialects. The variety is illustrated nicely by the forms of the name of the genre and its associated deity, which is sometimes the Homeric *παιήων* (D6. 121, 127), sometimes the unmarked *παιάν* (D2. 4). The Homeric forms *σαόφρων* (A1, D1) and *ὀνομάκλυτος* (D6. 123) are preferred to Pindar's normal usage; Homeric also would seem to be *ἄελίου δέμας* at G1. 14, and perhaps the disyllabic *παῖς* at D6. 77 (not otherwise in Pindar, though it occurs in Lesbian lyric). *Λατόος* at D5. 44 is preferred to Pindar's normal contracted form (for metrical reasons?); *Θ[ρ]αῖκίαν* at D2. 25 contrasts with *Θρηῖκι-* at *Pyth.* 4. 205, but the significance of this variation, if any, is unclear; it could even be an error (cf. the variation at D2. 98).⁴

The style of the *Paianes* is straightforward and simple. A good example is the opening triad of the apotropaic A1, particularly the extended question in lines 13 ff., in which the singer lists a number of possible afflictions that an eclipse might portend for Thebes;⁵ also

⁴ Another Doric formation is the inflexion *ἐμίν, τίν*, represented in D3 and A2; this is associated with the *διθύραμβος* in ΣAr. *Birds*, 930 (White (1914), 176) *χλευάζει τῶν διθύραμβοποιῶν τὸν συνεχῆ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις δωρισμὸν καὶ μάλιστα τὸν Πίνδαρον συνεχῶς λέγοντα ἐν ταῖς αἰτῇσεσι τὸ "ἐμίν"* ('He ridicules the poets of *διθύραμβοι* for their continual use of Doric forms, and particularly Pindar continually saying *ἐμίν* in prayers'); see also the discussion of Trümper (1988), 119ff. Another probable Doric form is *Ἰκάδιος ἐν* at D2. 46 could be imitated from Boeotian or a NW dialect: see Pavese (1972), 89ff.; Trümper (1988), 101. Finally, three phantoms: first, the genitive form *Κλεός* in C1 (from *Κλεώ*), which has been supposed to be a Doric form, is probably illusory (see pp. 242–3); secondly, GH suggested the Doric present participle *ἐν* at D2. 75, but that is almost certainly wrong; thirdly, if 'Pindar fr. 338' (=R41) is by Pindar, and comes from a *Paian*, then we might be able to add the W. Greek *ἱαρός*, but in fact the presence of this unparalleled dialect form is an argument against the supposition of Pindaric origin for the fragment.

⁵ It is interesting to note that Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Dem.* 142. 2ff.) uses the opening of A1 in connection with a demonstration that if the language of the central speech of Plato's *Phaedrus* were given cola (*μέλη*) and rhythms, it would resemble

the speech of Euxantius at D4. 40 ff., with its roughly symmetrical antitheses. Another example would be the narrative concerning Achilles and Neoptolemus in the second triad of D6: this is fairly simple in layout, without any direct speech, and follows the natural order of events except for a brief flashback describing Apollo's anger that Neoptolemus had killed Priam and his oath that he would not return (lines 112 ff.); it is also considerably longer than most narratives in the *Epinikia*, and certainly longer than those in the Aeginetan *Epinikia*, which are more rapid and allusive, perhaps presupposing greater familiarity with the material on the part of the audience.

Epithets and circumstantial detail are used more sparingly than in the *Epinikia*. As an illustration it is worth comparing the description of the birth of Apollo and Artemis in G1 with the more elaborate description of the birth of Iamus in *Ol.* 6. 39 ff.:⁶

ἀ δὲ φοινικόκροκον ζώναν καταθηκαμένα
 40 κάλπιδά τ' ἀργυρέαν λόχμας ὑπὸ κυανέας
 τίκτε θεόφρονα κοῦρον. τᾷ μὲν ὁ χρυσοκόμας
 πραῦμητίν τ' Ἑλείθιαν παρέστασ' ἐν τε Μοίρας·
 ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχχνων ὑπ' ὠδίνεσσ' ἐραταῖς Ἴαμος
 ἐς φάος αὐτίκα . . .

(She, laying down her girdle of purple cloth and the silver vessel under a dark bush, bore the divine-minded boy. By her the gold-haired one set gentle-minded Eleithuia and the Fates. At once Iamos came from under her womb with passionate birth-pangs into the light.)

There is no analogue in the description of the birth in the *Paian* for the details that precede the birth, or for the insistent use of epithets (φοινικόκροκον, ἀργυρέαν, κυανέας, θεόφρονα, χρυσοκόμας, πραῦμητιν).⁷

Nevertheless, the style of the *Paianes* has its share of colourful epithets. Some of these suggest Homer: χαλκοθώραξ (D2. 1), χαλκοκορυστής (D6. 108), ὀνομάκλυτος (D6. 123; Pindar elsewhere has forms in ὄνυμα-). The short fragment D1 contains several epi-

poetry. In fact, the point can be reversed: if one were to remove cola and rhythms from certain passages of the *Paianes*, what remained would differ little from prose.

⁶ The simple style of G1 (particularly lines 12–17) can be compared to Isyllus' description of the birth of Asclepius (*παιάν*, 52 ff.): ἐν δὲ θυώδει τεμένει τέκε-|το ἴνῃ Αἴγλα, γονίμῃ δ' ἔλυσεν ὠδί-|να Διὸς παῖς μετὰ Μοιρᾶν Λάχεσίς τε μαί' ἀγανά ('In the fragrant shrine Aigle gave birth to a son, and her birth-pang was relaxed by the daughter of Zeus with the Moirai and Lachesis, the glorious midwife').

⁷ A similar contrast can be drawn between the accounts of the birth of Heracles in *Nem.* 1 and S1, but there is no special reason to believe that S1 is from a *Paian*.

thets which are either rare or otherwise unattested in poetry of this period: ἄκοτον, οἰκόθετον, Θεμίγονοι, φιλησιστέφανον (cf. *PMG* 1035 col. 1. 1 = R98 παιᾶνι φιλοστεφάν[ω] ('a παιᾶν that loves the garland')), and another cluster of rare adjectives comes in the invocation to Aegina at the start of the third triad of D6: ἄδορπον, ναυπρύτανιν, θεμίξενον. Other rare epithets are νεόπολις (D2. 28) and τελεσσιεπής (D7. 2).

Distinctive too is language reflecting the ritual context of παιᾶνες, e.g. sacrifice. Compare the unusual passive θύεται in D6. 62 (perhaps reflecting an idiom current in the language of cult),⁸ the unique ὑπεργανάει cited in a lemma on D3. 95 (cf. D7. 8), the extraordinary phrase παιήνων ἄδορπον (D6. 127–8), which fuses song and sacrifice in a single image; there was also a specialized vocabulary related to the ritual shout.⁹

(c) *Manipulation of generic conventions*

The παιᾶν was well established long before Pindar's lifetime. One thinks of the famous παιᾶν by Tynnichus of Chalcis, as well as compositions by the various poets active in Sparta in the seventh century BC, such as Xenocritus of Locri, whose παιᾶν Pindar pays homage to in G9 (fr. 140b). There can be no question that Pindar comes at the end of a long tradition of παιᾶν composition.

Ideally, a study like the present one would compare Pindar's negotiation of the genre with that of his predecessors and contemporaries, but so little is known about the genre either before Pindar or in his own day that such comparisons are very difficult. For example, comparison of the formal aspects of the παιᾶνες on stone suggests that they tended to have shorter stanzas than Pindar's *Paianes*, and that they made more use of the παιᾶν refrain. So one possibility is that Pindar was responsible for introducing longer stanzas and restricting the use of the refrain, though it is equally possible that in both respects Pindar was following earlier literary παιᾶνες, such as those of Xenocritus.

Where we can judge Pindar's contribution is in the area of the manipulation of generic conventions. There is a tendency to think of such manipulation as a Hellenistic phenomenon, and certainly it became more prevalent in that period. However, we know that as

⁸ See p. 22.

⁹ ῥόθος at G1. 16, ῥόθια at D6. 129, ὁμορόθου at Sim. *PMG* 519 fr. 35(b) 10; compare ἐπ]εφθέγγαντο at G1. 19, with the later technical term ἐπίφθεγμα.

early as the fifth century BC poets were ringing changes on generic conventions, and doing so with respect to the *παιάν*: that is clear from Bacchylides 16, which plays on the use of *παιάν* and *διθύραμβος* at Delphi. And that Pindar would be capable of similar artifice is suggested by the opening of *Isthmian* 6, the myth of which concerns a meeting between Telamon and Heracles at a *συνπόσιον* and a prophecy uttered by Heracles there. The proem appropriately enough relates to the context of the *συνπόσιον*, presenting a sequence of three prayers and libations which (as we saw in §5f) is an adaptation of the normal one. The first two prayers—to Nemean Zeus and Poseidon—correspond to victories already won by Phylacides at Nemea and the Isthmos, whereas the third, to Olympian Zeus, anticipates one hoped for at Olympia. In a sense the implication of the proem is that *Isthmian* 6 as a whole is a sort of *συνπόσιον-παιάν*, amounting to a prayer that Phylacides achieve an Olympian victory, and assimilating the context of *κῶμος* celebration associated with the *ἐπινίκιον* to the context of the *συνπόσιον-παιάν*. So this passage comes very close to a generic manipulation of the *παιάν*.¹⁰

Here are the passages in the *Paianes* which seem to show manipulation of generic conventions (none of these is as clear-cut as Bacchylides 16):

1. Functions are sometimes suggested by motifs. Thus, there may be an allusion to the association between *παιάνες* and sacrifice or *συνπόσια* in the metaphor at D6. 127–8 (cf. also D1. 8); the reference to the healing power of wine at D4. 26 perhaps reflects the link between the *παιάν* and healing.¹¹

2. I think of the subtle use of the refrain in D2, which on one occasion seems to suggest a victory *παιάν*, and on another a pre-battle *παιάν*.

3. The description of the death of Neoptolemus at Delphi in D6 may be meant to suggest Apollo's killing of Python, a traditional subject in *παιάνες* and (for many ancient sources) the scene of the origin of the genre.

4. D6 could be seen as an example of generic ambiguity, if the designation of the third triad of D6 as a *προσόδιον* were original (but it seems more likely that it is not).

¹⁰ For another case see Kurke (1988), on *Isth.* 1 (cf. the useful list *ibid.* 112 n. 39).

¹¹ Privitera (1972) touches on the use of motifs.

Other cases of Apollonian ambiguity can only be guessed at. Did Cassandra condemn Apollo in B3? Is the entrancing and destructive song of the Delphic *Κηληδόνες* in B2 merely an extreme case of a two-edged Apolline *παῖάν*?

19. RELIGIOUS ISSUES

Are any of the representations of gods and the sacred found in the *Paianes* distinctive or unusual? The evidence is slim, but sufficient to support a few suggestions.

(a) *Moral messages*

The final line of B1—all that survives of the song—seems to be an instruction addressed to someone to ‘behave very justly’. The context is entirely obscure, as is the nature of the song, but there is a chance that this line represents a moral imperative uttered by Apollo or some representative of his.¹ Another fragment, F1, contrasts divine wisdom and mortal ignorance, and it is possible that the context of this was an encomium of the boundless knowledge of Apollo (cf. *Pyth.* 9. 44 ff.).

In the surviving *Paianes* the gods are presented as avengers of human transgression. Thus, D6 relates the conflict between Apollo and the Aiakidai, particularly Neoptolemus. Apollo is a destroyer in the Niobe myth also, which was probably the subject of one of the *Paianes* (F9). Similarly, D4 tells how Euxantius was terrorized by the gods.

Signs that the gods work for human well-being are rarer, but this seems to be the implication of B2: the reason why the gods bury the third temple and the *Κηληδόνες* must be that they disapprove of the deaths of pilgrims at Delphi. The *πρόνοια* of Zeus is mentioned in G1 with respect to the birth of Apollo.

(b) *The representation of Apollo*

In A1 identification between Apollo and the Sun may be implied; similarly, at G1. 14–15 Apollo and Artemis are said to flash like the sun as they are born. References to brightness are common in

¹ Moral maxims associated with Delphi: Defradas (1954), 268 ff.; Wilkins (1926); Parke and Wormell (1956), i. 387 ff.; R. Parker (1983), 140.

the genre, and the link is underwritten by a conceptual antithesis between *παῖάν* and chthonic.²

Apollo shows his more violent side in the *Paianes* (Achilles, Neoptolemus, Niobe). Although he is addressed as *ἀγανώτατος* in G3, his most common epithet in the *Paianes* is *ἐκαβόλος*, which also seems to imply the violent side of his nature.³ Contrast the more peaceful Apollo of the Pythian *Epinikia*: the catalogue of his benefits to mankind at *Pyth.* 5. 63 ff. (medicine, music, peace) and his association with peace at *Pyth.* 8. 8 ff., with *ἀρμονία* at *Pyth.* 8. 68 ff., and with peaceful music at *Pyth.* 1. 1 ff.⁴

Finally, the *Paianes* seem to emphasize the link between Apollo and Zeus. Pindar has Zeus present at the birth of Apollo (G1. 10), and he makes him ultimately responsible for choosing the site of Delphi by sending the eagles (H1); in the song he composed for the Aeginetans for the Delphic Theoxenia (D6), he gives Zeus a prominent position, beginning the song with a reference to the god (line 1), associating him with the aetiology of the Delphic Theoxenia (line 68), and having Zeus and Apollo jointly punish the Aiakidai in the myth section of the song.⁵

(c) *Prophecy and the παῖάν*

Prophecy is of great importance in Pindar's articulation of the *παῖάν*. B2 and D6 both start with an invocation of Delphi 'famous for seers'. D7 starts with a reference to prophecies, and the proem seems to have told of the birth of the Theban seer Tenerus, as did A1. The theme 'birth of a prophet' is found only once in the *Epinikia* (the birth of Iamus in *Olympian* 6). Similarly, Bacchylides' *Paian* in honour of the cult of Apollo Puthaieus at Asine relates the foundation of the cult by the seer Melampus. Melampus is also mentioned in Pindar, D4, in a sort of mythological paradigm, and the explanation for this may be that there was a convention of

² Brightness and the genre: at D2. 67 an Abderite military victory is an *ὑπέρτατον φέγγος*; the 'παῖάν to Sleep' in Soph. *Phil.* (pp. 109–10) involves reference to light; also the expression *παῖών δὲ λάμπει* at OT 186. Antithesis between *παῖάν* and chthonic: pp. 49–50.

³ *ἐκαβόλος*: D6. 79, 111; A1. 38; G8. 61 (35); Timotheus, *PMG* 800. 3; *ἐκηβελέτης* or *ἐκηβόλος* at Sim. *PMG* 519 fr. 35(b) 8. Possibly *ἐκάεργος*: C2. 35. For a survey of Pindar's epithets for Apollo see Stefos (1975), 321 ff.

⁴ Pindar's attitude to Apollo as it emerges from the *Epinikia*: Duchemin (1955), 108 ff.; Stefos (1975), 267 ff. For *ἀρμονία* at *Pyth.* 8. 68 ff. see Taillardat (1986); Hubbard (1983); Miller (1989).

⁵ See Duchemin (1955), 340; Dumézil (1982), 74 ff.

mentioning seers in *παιᾶνες*. A similar explanation may account for the probable reference to the Delphic seer Panthoos in D6, who moved from Delphi to Troy and therefore provides a good transition from Delphic to Trojan myth. In another *Paian* Pindar may have represented the *ἀλκυονίς* as a sort of prophet of calm weather (D8). The model for some of this 'story of the seer' material was perhaps the pseudo-Hesiodic *Melampodia*, which probably contained life-stories of a number of seers, not just Melampus. The theme of B3 seems to have been a prophecy made by Cassandra on the occasion of the departure of Paris for Greece. In a section of D2 which is a narrative describing a victory of the Abderites over the local Thracians, mention is made of a prophecy delivered by Hecate foretelling victory before the battle. A2 may have contained a genealogical prophecy, perhaps concerning a future Apolline seer. According to a secondary source, Pindar's *Paianes* contained a reference to the priestesses of the cults of Zeus Ammon and Zeus at Dodona (D2). There are probable references to prophecy in E1. 9 and G4. 3. A prophecy relating to Laius was mentioned in the *Paianes* (D4).⁶

At several points in the extant *Paianes* Pindar seems to want to draw an analogy between song and prophecy: most dramatically in B2, where he describes the mythical *Κηληδόνες*, who bewitched mortals with their song and are clearly thought of as precursors to the Pythian priestesses of Pindar's day. The idea of a linkage between song and prophecy is also suggested in the opening of that song, which began with an invocation of the seers of Delphi, rather than the Muses; and also in the proem to D6, which strongly suggests an analogy between Delphi, which is invoked with the epithet *κλυτόμαντις*, and the singer, who describes himself as a *Πιερίδων προφάταν*. If more of Pindar's *Paianes* survived, we might expect to find more examples of the relationship between song and prophecy.⁷

(d) *Cultic μίμησις*

Singers often act out the behaviour of mythological characters. This is a common feature of Greek ritual: one only has to think of

⁶ For the pseudo-Hesiodic *Melampodia* see Loeffler (1963); there is another reference to prophecy in the fragment of scholia D13.

⁷ There may be another case of linkage between poetry and prophecy at D2. 78ff. (see p. 273); relevant too may be the cult of the Muses at Delphi, as can be inferred from Sim. *PMG* 577 (=Plut. *Pyth. or.* 402 c–d), for which see Rutherford (1990), 196ff.

the Delphic Septerion, where an ἀμφιθαλὴς κοῦρος acts out Apollo's flight and purification. Sometimes pilgrims re-enact mythological journeys; for example, the Athenian Puthais re-enacted the second half of Apollo's journey from Delos, through Attica and on to Delphi (a journey described in the *παιάν* of Limenios); Athenian θεωροί to Delos may have believed that they were following the path that Leto took when Athena Pronoia led her from Zoster to Delos. Choral performances of song procession or song-dance can also be mimetic. In some cases such μίμησις seems to be an extension of a mythological exemplum, as in D4, where the singers who prefer Ceos to a richer homeland cite the example of their ancestor Euxantius, who did the same, and in so doing come close to impersonating him. In other cases a song procession imitates a mythological journey, as the singers of S4 (which may or may not be from a *Paian*) act out the journey made by Aiakos; in D1 the singers may accompany representations of Eniautos and the Horai; and in D6 there seems to be a parallel between the singers, who come to Delphi to defend their τιμαί, and Neoptolemus, who dies at Delphi fighting over his. The singers of D6 may also be seen as impersonating Apollo's return to Delphi, at least at the beginning of the song.⁸

20. PERFORMANCE, ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ, AND TEXT

In discussing performance of the *Paianes*, it is necessary to distinguish a prima-facie approach and a more speculative approach. The former is this: Pindar composed the *Paianes* for performance on a specific occasion, usually a festival. The performers were χοροί (thus, the speaking subject seems generally to be a choral 'I'), and the movement processional. The proem of D2 seems to specify that the χορός are processing to a shrine of Apollo Derenus and Aphrodite; similarly, in the proem of D7 a χορός seems to be processing towards a shrine of Apollo (perhaps the Ismenion). The

⁸ Delphic Septerion: pp. 201–3; Deipnias (§6 n. 16) had a part in this. Journey as re-enactment of myth: Curtius (1853), 40ff. At Heliod. *Aith.* 4. 19 the μίμησις of myth in ritual is taken a stage further: the visiting χορός of the Aenianes, who are commemorating Neoptolemus and trace their origin from him, themselves commit a Neoptolemus-like outrage at Delphi by carrying off the priestess Charicleia. For examples of corresponsion between rite and aetiology see the useful survey of Back (1883); Nagy (1996), ch. 4. In Hindu ritual too, young men and women (known as *svarups*) impersonate deities.

monostrophic structure of D5 also suggests procession. If the term *προσοδιακὸς παιάν* used by a scholion on *Isthmian* 1 refers to D4, it will be an indication that someone believed that the song was performed in procession.¹ The third triad of D6 is referred to as a *Prosodion* in the title at line 123, and it seems to have circulated independently as a *Prosodion*; it is not clear what implications this has for the performance of the first two triads.

The *prima-facie* approach also allows that a song might have had a range of secondary purposes. First, although the original performance is the important one, there could have been various others:

1. Repeated performance in the context of cult. After all, celebrations of festivals and visits of pilgrims to them were both repeatable. That may be why there is stress on the idea of the 'immortal labour' of religious function in some of the songs, the idea being that the labour of performing the song is endlessly repeated.²

2. Secondary performances by a *χορός*, perhaps in other locations, e.g. the home polis. Thus, in S3 the singer says that the Muses ensure that even people who had not visited the festival should hear about it: this could imply reperformance in the local community, reproducing the conditions of the festival.

3. Secondary performances in other contexts, e.g. the *συμπόσιον* (like the performances of Simonidean *μέλη* referred to at *Ar. Clouds*, 1357–8).³

Furthermore, although the *prima-facie* approach would tend to emphasize that the main function of the song is performance, it would allow that some people would have access to the song in written form, either through dedication and display of the text of a song in a temple or some other ritually significant place, or through circulation in the form of a papyrus roll or a book.⁴

It may be to accommodate such secondary functions that poets included passages descriptive of performance, such as the opening of Pindar, D2, where the *χορός* describe themselves as progressing from the sanctuary of Abderus to the sanctuaries of Apollo Derenus and Aphrodite. If the only function of the song is that of an inau-

¹ Choral 'I': pp. 67–8. Monostrophic structure: p. 164. *προσοδιακὸς παιάν*: see p. 106.

² For immortal labour see p. 249 n. 19.

³ Nagy (1990), 107–8.

⁴ Display in temples: see §14a. Casual reading: *Ar. Frogs*, 52, describes Dionysus reading a text of Euripides' *Andromeda*.

gural performance, what would be the need for such passages? The identity and direction of the performers would be obvious at the original performance. However, such passages of self-description make more sense if the poet took account of the possibility of secondary performances and display or circulation in written form; in that case they serve the purpose of titles or brief prose introductions.

This *prima-facie* approach to performance may be contrasted with a more speculative approach, which starts from the following two observations. First, it may be mistaken to think that cult-songs were composed with some single, inaugural performance in mind. Rather, their purpose may have been repeated performances of the sort already described. Alternatively, the primary performance may be different from that suggested in the song, standing in a mimetic relationship to it. An example of how a song can give a misleading impression of the circumstances is provided by A1, in which the speaking subject seems to imitate the reactions of someone terrified by an eclipse of the sun, when in fact it seems likely that the song was both composed and performed some time afterwards.

Second, already in the fifth century BC the primary purpose of composition may have been display or circulation of a written text, at least in some cases. For example, the Pindaric song on the four Delphic temples (B2) may have been primarily intended to be displayed on or near the historical temple at Delphi. It may have been performed as well, but such performance need not have been the primary purpose. Such a text might have been commissioned by a polis, and dedicated in the temple there by *θεωροί*, without any inaugural choral performance. And we have seen plenty of evidence that the texts of poems and songs were dedicated in temples in this way.

An incidental consequence of the application of the more speculative approach would be to undercut a distinction drawn in orthodox genre theory between classical and Hellenistic poetry. In Hellenistic sacred poems, such as the *Hymnoi* of Callimachus, the text is supposed to be prior, and where the poem seems to describe performance, this is supposed to be *μίμησις* of ritual action, whereas cult songs of the classical period are deemed to have a direct relationship to the realities of cult and ritual. But now the possibility seems to arise that the traits that are supposed to be distinctive

of Hellenistic sacred poetry were already around in the fifth century BC.⁵

Attractive as these possibilities are, in my analyses of the individual songs I follow the prima-facie approach for the most part. But it is worth bearing in mind that it may not always be the whole story.

21. PINDAR AND DELPHI: INTERSECTING PANHELLENISMS

The sanctuary at Delphi is so important in the fragments of Pindar's *Paianes* that it is essential to get a clear understanding of his relationship with it. The bare facts are these. First, Pindar's songs show a general familiarity with Delphic institutions and traditions. He associates Delphi with wealth and prophecy; he knows the Alcmaeonid temple, and a Cretan dedication there; he shows knowledge of the frieze on the east pediment of the Siphnian treasury; he knows the layout of the Delphic *ὀμφαλός*, flanked by representations of birds; he is familiar with the festivals and the myths associated with them, such as the aetiology of the Delphic Theoxenia. He is aware of the notional role of Delphi as an advocate of colonization.¹

Notice, however, that none of this is esoteric knowledge: all these facts were widely known and disseminated in the fifth century BC. At Delphi Pindar is not an insider, but a visitor, a *θεωρός*, like the *χοροί* he composes for.² Furthermore, we do not find the same local or personal colour that infuses his treatment of the mythology of Thebes or Aegina: the comparative remoteness of his attitude to Delphi is suggested by *Pyth.* 8. 57 ff., where a description of the hero Alcmaeon, who encountered Pindar on his way to Delphi, is juxtaposed with a grand invocation of Apollo. Alcmaeon is described in the terms of personal religion as a *γείτων* ('neighbour') and as *κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν* ('guardian of my possessions'), whereas

⁵ Callimachus and performance scenario: Depew (1993); Cameron (1995), 63–7.

¹ Wealth and prophecy: *Pyth.* 4. 53; *Pyth.* 6. 8; D6. 1. Alcmaeonid temple: *Pyth.* 7. Cretan dedication: *Pyth.* 5; Roux (1962). Siphnian treasury: Shapiro (1988). *ὀμφαλός*: H1. Delphic Theoxenia: D6. 63 ff. The Septerion: pp. 201–3. Colonization: *Pyth.* 4–5; *Ol.* 9; Malkin (1987), 17 ff. The only text that might suggest a personal attitude to Delphi is the introduction to D6 (the singer loves Delphi as a child loves its mother), but I argue that the speaking subject here may well be the leader of an Aeginetan *chorós* and not the poet.

² For poets as *θεωροί* see Theognis, 809–10; Nagy (1990), 164–5.

the magnificent invocation of Apollo (lines 61 ff.) is far less personal.³

Second, Pindar relates various Delphic myths: the myth of Apollo's take-over, which had already been covered in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and by Simonides (we know only the bare outline of Pindar's account, but we can see that he added the detail that Apollo's take-over was opposed by Ge, who tried to send him to Tartarus: see H2); the myth of the four temples (B2), apparently undocumented before Pindar; the myth of the death of Neoptolemus at Delphi (*Nemean* 7; D6), perhaps rejecting an earlier version in which Neoptolemus attempted to sack the temple; and the myth of the *ὄμφαλός* and the eagles (H1).

Thus, Pindar could have been contributing to a programme of Delphic propaganda, organized by Delphic authorities. For example, the myth of the four temples could be designed to celebrate the institution of the Delphic temple. And the myth of the *ὄμφαλός* and the eagles (H1) might well be intended to propagate the idea that Delphi was the centre of the world, which would naturally increase its attractiveness to pilgrims.

Furthermore, two indications point towards a special association with Delphi. First, writing in the fourth century AD, Libanius says that Delphi bestowed prestigious rewards on Pindar (*Or.* 20. 2).⁴ This goes beyond a statement by Plutarch, which looks reliable, to the effect that Pindar's descendants were honoured at Delphi⁵ and a claim made in the late biographies to the effect that every evening, upon closing the temple, the Delphic priest

³ Personal religion in Pindar is discussed by Rusten (1983). If 'Pindar, fr. 104b' (a fragment describing how the epiphany of Apollo Galaxios stimulates local milk production) really is by Pindar, it might have a part in this argument, since a case of strong local colour in a description of Apollo in a non-Delphic song strengthens one's sense that Pindar's accounts of Delphi lack such local coloration. But the attribution to Pindar is not certain; see Francis (1972).

⁴ Πίνδαρος ὁ Θηβαῖος μειζόνων παρὰ τοῦ Πυθίου τετυχηκώς ἢ οἱ πλείστον χρύσιον ἐκέισε κεκοιμηκότες ('Pindar the Theban, who received greater rewards from Apollo than even those who made the greatest offerings of gold there'). Cf. Wilamowitz (1922), 129; Radt (1958), 116; Stefos (1975), 285 ff.

⁵ Plut. *De sera num. vind.* 557 F ἀναμνήσθητι δὲ τῶν ἐναγχοῦ Θεοξενίων καὶ τῆς καλῆς ἐκείνης μερίδος, ἣν ἀφαιροῦντες τοὺς Πινδάρου κηρύττουσι λαμβάνειν ἀπογόνους, ὥς σοι τὸ πρᾶγμα σεμνὸν ἐφάνη καὶ ἡδύ ('and remember last year's Theoxenia and the noble portion of the sacrifice which they take out and order the descendants of Pindar to take, what a dignified and attractive practice you thought this was'). In the 2nd cent. AD Pausanias says that he was shown an iron chair in which Pindar was said to have composed songs to Apollo (9. 22. 3).

invited his spirit in for dinner with Apollo.⁶ The natural implication of Libanius' statement is that he received honours such as the *προξενία*, *προμάντεια*, *προεδρία*, *προδικία*, *ἀτέλεια*, and *ἐπιτιμή*, which were awarded to Philodamus of Scarpheia, his brothers, and their descendants, to Aristonoos of Corinth (fourth century BC), and to Cleocharēs of Athens (third century BC).⁷ Confirmation of this hypothesis has been sought in D6. 11, which has been taken to refer to concrete honours enjoyed by Pindar at Delphi (and perhaps was taken this way even in antiquity).

A point against Libanius' testimony is the unreliability of many biographical data that survive from antiquity concerning the major Greek poets, particularly data with a religious dimension (one thinks of the tradition that Pindar saw Pan dancing to one of his songs, or that he consulted the oracle of Zeus Ammon about what was the greatest good for man).⁸ Thus, it seems advisable to treat the tradition of the Delphic awards with caution. Perhaps it is back projection of the later awards of such honours to poets in the Hellenistic age.

Nevertheless, there is a second indication of a close relationship between Pindar and Delphi in a poetic fragment preserved by the ancient biographical tradition, in which he specifies the date of his own birth with reference to the date of a Delphic festival, presumably the Pythian (H5).⁹ If the sacred calendar of Delphi was a natural chronological framework against which to chart his own life, this seems to indicate that Pindar's relationship with the locality was close (of course, the ancient interpretation of the fragment might be wrong).

The closeness of Pindar's relationship with Delphi is not in doubt. However, it was neither exclusive nor absolute. Simultaneously, he maintained a close relation with Olympia which is naturally inconspicuous in the *Paianes* (though the reference to 'Olympian Zeus' at the start of D6 suggests the Zeus of Olympia as well as the Zeus of Olympus). He also had some sort of relationship

⁶ *Vita Ambros.* Dr i. 2. 14; Eustath. *Proem.* Dr iii. 298. 1 ff.; see Nagy (1979) 124 n. 1.

⁷ Philod. *SIG* 270, Aristonoos *SIG* 449 (=FD iii/2 no. 190/1); Kleocharēs *SIG* 450 (=FD iii/2 no. 78). *προξενία*, which Delphi had perhaps not introduced as early as the 5th cent. BC, would not be among the honours: see Marek (1985), 171.

⁸ See Lefkowitz (1981); for Ammon see *Vita Ambros.* Dr i. 2. 19; for Pan see *Vita Ambros.* Dr i. 2. 2, and also §6 n. 19.

⁹ So Plut. *Sump. probl.* 717 D; H5: p. 398.

with Dodona: whether or not he wrote a *Paian* for Zeus at Dodona (see F2), he related the aetiological myth that Dodona and Ammon were founded by a dove-priest sent from Egyptian Thebes, which shows that it was not only Delphi that deserved a prestigious aetiology (cf. H1). Thus, Pindar emerges as a freelance poet, willing to compose for any of the national sanctuaries, without an exclusive commitment to any single one, even if he was closer to some than to others.

Pindar had his own identity and reputation as a poet. Like the national sanctuaries, he had a panhellenic perspective and authority, drawing on long panhellenic traditions of myth and poetics. In fact, the poet's panhellenism was purer and more fluid than that of the sanctuaries, tied as they were to a specific location with its own traditions. The relationship between Pindar and Delphi is thus roughly symmetrical: he does not merely serve Delphi as an agent of a programme of propaganda, but augments Delphi's panhellenic status by lending it his own. Pindar will have been inclined to show Delphi special favour because it was the seat of Apollo, whose sphere of influence included song. The deep connection between Delphi and song comes out in the myth of the four temples (B2), in which the *Κληηδόνες* are simultaneously archetypes of Apolline prophecy (for Delphi) and archetypes of panhellenic song (for Pindar). Just as the Delphic myth provides a paradigm for the Apolline poet, so Delphi provides the perfect venue for the display of Pindar's panhellenic voice.

Part of Pindar's panhellenism is his ability to mediate between Delphi and local communities. One fragment (S3, probably not about Delphi) seems to describe how poetry brings information about the festival to people who live far away. Another way in which the poet mediated between local and panhellenic spheres was by writing songs for performance by *χοροί* from local communities at the great sanctuaries, in which they might articulate local myths before an audience from all over Greece. The most suggestive example of a meeting between Delphian and local perspectives is unfortunately the hardest to interpret: D6 has turned out to have two sections, the first two triads 'for the Delphians' and the third 'for the Aeginetans'. Should this unique structure be construed as a strategy to effect cohesion between hosts and visitors, involving them as co-performers of the same song, but deploying the sensitive Delphic myth of the confrontation between Apollo and

Neoptolemus in the Delphian section, leaving the Aeginetans to praise their homeland? Or could the double structure commemorate a misunderstanding: the original version of the song offended the Aeginetans, and the third triad was added as a compensatory supplement? If more Delphian Paianes survived, we would perhaps find more examples of such negotiations between local and panhellenic points of view.¹⁰

¹⁰ D6: pp. 329–31, 336–9. For poetry and the panhellenic see Nagy (1990), 52 ff., 70 ff.

PART II

The Fragments of Pindar's *Paeans*

Note on the Text

IN my presentation of the material I have tried to strike a balance between completeness and economy. For each fragment, I include the text followed by testimonia and apparatus, scholia followed by apparatus to scholia, and finally translations of text and scholia. Ideally, I would have included diplomatic transcriptions of the papyrus texts, but to do so would have added unacceptably to the length of the book. My text is indebted to Maehler. The principal differences have to do with the organization of the fragments (see p. 139); I also include a number of smaller papyrus fragments and one manuscript fragment (F11) that Maehler omits.

I have transcribed the major editorial sigla of the papyri—coronis, asterisk, *παράγραφος*, *διπλή*, and χ —and I have tried to restore the coronis and asterisk in accordance with the practice of Π^4 (see above, pp. 139–40) even in other papyri. I have also followed Π^4 in using marginal titles rather than titles written in the column, except in problematic cases. The sublinear symbol \sim , which is of uncertain meaning (see p. 140; it is not a symbol of synizesis), I reproduce in the apparatus only.

Colometry turned out to be a particularly tricky issue. Ancient scholars deal in smaller units than the periods that modern metricians would accept; in cases where several lines belong to the same period, editors generally inset all but the first, to show that they are not independent metrically, thus marrying modern metrics to ancient. However, there are also cases where ancient scholars seem to have missed breaks between periods, and here it is necessary to rearrange the ancient colometry. Such rearrangements depend in some cases on editorial discretion, and some of my decisions in this area differ from those of other editors. An explanation of the choices I have made will be found in the Metrical Appendix. Such rearrangements of the ancient colometry incidentally account for what might be considered the occasionally irrational nature of the line-numbering I use: the line-numbers refer to the ancient colometry, and I considered the advantage of giving them up to carry less weight than the inconvenience that would be caused to readers consulting works of criticism and reference which use the traditional numeration.

My apparatus owes much to Maehler, to the original editors, and to Gerber (1976). Accents, breathings, punctuation, and other diacritical signs have been reported only where the interpretation of the text is problematic. In reporting doubtful letters, I have not tried to provide a comprehensive

list of alternative readings where nothing seemed to hang on it. In registering supplements, I mention only the more pertinent, and make no claim to completeness. Lemmata appear in the apparatus only when their omission would lead to obscurity. In the apparatus, letters are given in capitals when the shape is important (and there I use the forms C and Ω). In such formulae, 'AB or $\Gamma\Delta$ ' is short for: 'either A or Γ followed by either B or Δ '.

The following is a list of the editorial symbols that I use, mostly conforming to the Leiden system (*CE* 7 (1932), 262 ff.):

Signs found in both text and apparatus

- α identifies a letter as uncertain
- marks a letter as unreadable
- < > mark letters omitted from the papyrus but supplied by the editor
- [] mark lacunae
- [.] signifies that one letter is lost
- ┌ ┐ enclose a section of text lost in the papyrus but cited in another source
- ~10 a space of approximately 10 letters
- < 10 a space of 10 letters or less
- ~? identifies a lacuna of uncertain size
- | in scholia indicates a line-break
- ⋮ boundary between papyrus fragments when join is conjectural
- * * * lines missing

Signs found only in the apparatus

- : on the left a lemma from the text, on the right alternative readings
- ; separates readings
- || indicate letters in the papyrus marked for deletion by an ancient editor
- { } mark letters in the papyrus which modern editors believe should be removed
- () fill out an abbreviation (in scholia)
- Πⁱ the papyrus records the reading in the line
- Π^s the papyrus records the reading above the line
- Π^{ac} the papyrus recorded the reading before being corrected
- Π^{pc} the papyrus recorded the reading after being corrected
- Σ scholion
- Σ^a, Σ^b scholia in different hands (variants of hand H, used for *διόρθωσις*, or hand S, used in scholia): signs used only where it is important to distinguish different hands. See §14 n. 21
- Σ^δ the uncial hand of *διόρθωσις* (=GH's h)
- Σ^{δ1} almost identical to the hand of the text (=GH's h1)
- Σ^{δ2} various less regular forms (=GH's h2)
- Σ^{δ3} a subform with slanting letters and light ink (=GH's h3)

- Σ^e the hand of scholia
 Σ^{e1} a form with regular letters (GH's s1)
 Σ^{e2} a cursive form (GH's s2)

I refer to the various papyri using SM's symbols, which I list here, together with the corresponding numbers in Pack (1967):

$\Pi^4 = POxy$ 841 = Pack 1361	$\Pi^{11} = POxy$ 408 = Pack 1373
$\Pi^5 = PSI$ ii. 147 = Pack 1362	$\Pi^{26} = POxy$ 2442 = Pack 1360
$\Pi^6 = POxy$ 1791 = Pack 1364	$\Pi^{28} = POxy$ 2440 = Pack 1366
$\Pi^7 = POxy$ 1792 = Pack 1363	$\Pi^{29} = POxy$ 2441 = Pack 1370
$\Pi^{7*} = POxy$ 1792 re-edited in Lobel (1961)	$\Pi^{34} = POxy$ 2448 = Pack 1377
$\Pi^8 = PBerol$ 13411 = Pack 1365	$\Pi^{37} = POxy$ 2449 = Pack 1382
	$\Pi^{45} = POxy$ 3822 (not in Pack)

It will also be helpful to mention here some basic metrical symbols (for other aspects of metre see the Metrical Appendix):

- long syllable¹
- short syllable¹
- × anceps syllable
- ⊙ syllable of uncertain quantity²
 - anceps syllable, usually long but sometimes short
 - anceps syllable, usually short but sometimes long
- ν ν lengthens a preceding short syllable

Line-numbers are given to the left of the text. The numbers at the right-hand edge (in increments of 3) refer to metrical periods (for which see the Metrical Appendix). Where only the end of a poem survives, I sometimes number from the end, using negative numbers (–n). As stated earlier, line-numbers derive from the ancient edition, and are sometimes inevitably inconsistent with the modern colometry. In reporting scholia I specify their position in the text by citing the number of the line(s) near which they occur, which may not in all cases be the line(s) to which they refer.

¹ In papyri the symbols – and ∪ are sometimes used to indicate long and short vowels. I reproduce these signs in the apparatus only; in the text they are used exclusively as metrical symbols.

² NB. In the Metrical Appendix this is indicated by the underdot, which means 'uncertain letter' in the text.

Fragments of Π^4

Group A

A1 (*Pa.* IX)

str. A 𐀀 Ἀκτις ἀελίου, τί πολύσκοπ' ἐμήσαο,
[Θηβαίους] ὦ μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων, ἄστρον ὑπέρτατον
eis Ἰσμήνιον] ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κλεπτόμενον; <τί δ'> ἔθηκας ἀμάχανον ἰσχύν
col. 2 τ' ἀνδράσι
καὶ σοφίας ὁδόν,
5 ἐπίσκοτον ἀτραπὸν ἐσσυμένα;
ἐλαύνεις τι νεώτερον ἢ πάρος;
ἀλλὰ σε πρὸς Διός, ἵπποσὸς θεάς,
ἵκετεύω, ἀπήμονα,
εἰς, ὄλβον τινὰ τράποιο Θήβαις,
[] ὦ πύργια, πάγκοινον τέρας,
9
ant. A 11 :]ρα[— — — — —
[— — — — —
] ὦνδς [—], [πολέμοιο δὲ σᾶμα φέρεις τινός,, ἢ κ,αρ-
ποῦ φλίσιν
3 ἢ νιφετοῦ σθένος,
15 ὑπ,έρφατον, ἢ στάσιν οὐλομένην,
ἢ πόντου κενεώσις ἄμ πέδον,,
ἢ παγετὸν χ,θονὸς ἢ νότιον θέρος,
6 ὕδατι ζακότ,ω ρέον,
col. 3 ἢ γαῖαν κατακλύσαισα θήσεις
[] ἀνδρῶν νέον ἐξ ἀρχᾶς γένος;
9
ep. A 21 ὀλοφύρομαι οὐδέν, ὃ τι πάντων μέτα πείσομαι,
lacuna probably comprising the rest of ep. A and str. B. 1-3a,
though there may have been one or more intervening triads

- str. B
col. 4 σάματι δ'] ἐκράνθηγν ὑπὸ 3
δαιμονίῳ τινὶ
35 λέχει πέλας ἀμβροσίῳ Μελίας
ἀγανὸν καλάμῳ συνάγεν θρόον
μήδεσ' τε φρενὸς ὑμ[ε]τέραν χάριν. 6
λιτανεύω, ἐκαβόλε,
Μοισαίαις ἀν[α]τιθεὶς τέχνα[ι]σι
— χρηστήριον .[.] .[.] .[.] .[.] .[.] 9
ant. B 41 ἐν ᾧ Τήνερον εὐρυβίαν θεμίτ[ων] —
ἐξαίρετον προφάταν ἔτεκ[εν] λέχει
κόρα μιγεῖσ' Ὠκεανοῦ Μελία σέο, Πύθ[ι]ε[ε. τῶ] Κάδμου
στρατὸν 3
καὶ Ζεάθου πόλιν,
45 ἀκερσεκόμα πάτερ, ἀνορέας
ἐπέτρεψας ἕκατι σαόφρονος.
καὶ γὰρ ὁ πόντιος Ὀρσ[ιτ]ρίαινά νιν 6
περίαλλα βροτῶν τίεν,
49 Εὐρίπου τε συνέτεινε χῶρον.
(the second epode is missing, and any other triads)

1-9, 13-21 D.H. *Dem.* 7. 1. 142 ff. (MSS M, B, P in Usener and Radermacher (1889), i. 2) 1-10 Armenian trans. of Philo, *De providentia*, 2, p. 97 Aucher (see Rutherford (1996b); Aucher worked from MS 1040 in the library of San Lazzaro degli Armeni in Venice (= Catalogue 1668; dated to AD 1296); thanks to the kindness of Father Vertanes I was able to check the readings in Aug. 1998) 2-3, 5, 21(?) Plut. *De fac. in orbe lun.* 931 E 2-3 Philostr. *Ep.* 53, 250. 2-5 Kayser 9-18, 34-49 Π⁺ fr. 126-8 The song may also be referred to in Pliny, *NH* 2. 12. 54. Plut. and Pliny may draw on an earlier astronomical source: Görgemanns (1970), 125 ff.; Wil. (1900), 40; Boll (1909), 2332

1 τί: τά Schroeder (1923), because Arm. may presuppose παῖ here, but see Rutherford (1996b), 39 n. 12 πολυσκόπ' (but cf. Chandler (1881), 139) πολύσκοπ' ἐμήσας PLG²: πολύσκοπ' ἐμῆς θεῶ μ' ἄτερ D.H.; πολύσκοπε μῆσαι Blass (1869) 2 δμάτερ' Hermann (1845) 3 (τί δ') Diehl (1917): <μάλ'> Wil: <τύ γ'> GH: <δ> Arm. 3-4 Blass (1869): ἰσχὺν πτανὸν ἀνδρ. D.H. 5 ἐπίσκοπον Ms, Arm.: ἐπίσκοπον M; -πτον B; -πτεν P ἀτραπὸν ἐσσυμένα Schneider (1776): ἀτροπον ἐσσυμένα 6 ἐλαύνεις M: -νειν P, Arm.; -νει B τί B. Currie 7 ἵπποσά PLG², θοάς Blass (1869): ἵπποσθαθός MBP; θεός Farnell (1930) (cf. Armenian trans.) 9 τράποιο Sylburg (1586): τρόποιο MBP 13 .[.] ὨΝΟC[or .[.] ὨΝΟE[; αἰ]ῶνος Bornemann (1928) δέ σάμα GH: πολέμου δισάμα MBP; δῆ σάμα Scaliger (1577) (end) 'quam canto' Arm. 16 Schr (1908): κενέωσιν MBP ἄμ Hermann (1845): ἀλλὰ Π; ἀναί Wil (1921);

ἀνῶπεδον Sitzler (1911a) 18 Schr (1900) (cf. GH): ἱερόν MBP 19 Barnes
 ap. Reiske (1777): θήσει Π 21 suppl. Hermann (1845) 33 Rutherford:
 δέιματι or τέρατι Wil 35 XEJ 37 μήδεσαι Π 38 P^{nc}: ΕΚΑΤΑΒΟΛΕ Π
 40 [[ΠΩΛΟ.Τ[. .]] or [[ΠΩ[] ΛΟ.Τ[. .]] N (N possible if the oblique stroke is lost)
 Ω)ΠΟΛΛΟΝΤ[ΕΟ]N GH, Ferrari (1992a) (more likely than not); [ἀντει]λον, i.e. ἀ[ν]τειλον
 ('arise') Diehl (1917) τ[όθ]ι Bury ap. GH 41 THN ποτέ GH; σκοπόν Ruther-
 ford 42 ἐτεκ' ἀνθεῖ Theiler (1941) 44 καὶ Π: ἄν Wil (1921) (to preserve the
 transmitted colometry); alternatively τῶ] Κάδμου Ζεάθου τε πολὺν στράτον Ruther-
 ford 47 Π³: ΠΟΝΤΟC Π' [ιτ] Lobel, since [οτ] is too long

Σ 2 (Σ^ε) [< 25] | [< 25] σ | [< 25 Πύ]δαρο(s) |
 18 (Σ^{δ1}) (below column) ἡ νότιον θ(έρος) ἐν [ῶ νότος πνεῖ < 40] | ἡ
 μεγαλοκότῳ ὕδατι < 45] | ἡ παρὰ τὸ νοτε[ρόν < 45] |
 22 (Σ^ε)]is
 25 (Σ^{δ1}) [< 25]ομους | (Σ^{δ2}) [< 25]τατου | (Σ^{ε2}) < 22 ἐπ]ιτελ-
 λομενα
 29 (Σ^{ε2}) [< 25]ίζουσι | [< 25]s σὺν α[. |
 32 (Σ^{ε2}) [< 25]μμε[. .]
 33 (above line) (Σ^{ε2}) ἐπ[ε]τ[ε]λέσθη
 35a (Σ^{δ1}) (above line) τῶ [Ὶσ]μηνίῳ λέγει
 35b (Σ^{δ1}) (on right) ἀντ(ι τοῦ) ἐγγ[ύς τοῦ ἱεροῦ < 10]
 35c (Σ^{δ1}) (at right) ἐν τούτῳ[< 25] | με[< 25] | τη[< 25]
 36 (Σ^{δ1}) (above the line) με[ε]τ' αὐλοῦ τὴν ῶδὴν < ᾶ)π[ο]διδούς
 37 (Σ^{ε2}) (above the line) τοῖς ποιήμασι
 40 (Σ^{δ1}) τὸ ἐν Θῆ[βαις Ἰσμήμιον < 25]
 49 (Σ^{δ1}) μεταπο[< 25]

18 GH 36 ὑπ[ο]διδούς Π 49 μεταπο[ρευθῆναι λέγεται GH

[MARGINAL TITLE: *For Thebans to the Ismenion*] Beam of the sun! What have you contrived, observant one, mother of eyes, highest star, in concealing yourself in broad daylight? Why have you made helpless men's strength and the path of wisdom, by rushing down a dark highway? Do you drive a stranger course than before? In the name of Zeus, swift driver of horses, I beg you, turn the universal omen, lady, into some painless prosperity for Thebes . . . Do you bring a sign of some war or wasting of crops or a mass of snow beyond telling or ruinous strife or emptying of the sea on to land or frost on the earth or a rainy summer flowing with raging water, or will you flood the land and create a new race of men from the beginning? I lament nothing that I suffer with everyone. . . . I have been ordained by some fateful (sign?) near the immortal bed of Melia to link noble voices by means of the αὐλός and the counsels of my mind for your sake. I beseech you, far-shooter, dedicating your oracle to the arts of the Muses . . . in which Oceanus' daughter Melia, joined with you in your bed, god of Pytho, once (?) bore Tenerus, broad in force, distinguished interpreter of oracles. To him, father with unshorn hair, you entrusted

Cadmus' folk in the city of Zeathus on account of his temperate courage. For once the sea god who shakes the trident honoured him above all other men and directed [his chariot] towards the ground of Euripus.

(2) . . . Pindar. (18) *Or a rainy summer* because the south-west wind blows in it. Or with raging [water] . . . (either because of the wet (?) or beside the wet (?)). (25) . . . Being ordered. . . (34) I was completed. (35a) He means the Ismenian one. (35b) Instead of near the temple. (35c) In this . . . (36) producing song with the αὐλός (37) The poems. (40) The Ismenion in Thebes. (49) Going after . . .

The first triad contains a series of questions addressed to a beam of the sun, in which the singer asks what is portended by a recent eclipse. What is left of the second triad (if it is the second)¹ seems to be the introduction to a cult hymn performed at Thebes in honour of Apollo Ismenios and the hero Tenerus. A mythological narrative is just beginning when the papyrus breaks off, but this could have been concluded within the second triad, so we may have most of the song. The implied place of performance is almost certainly the Ismenion at Thebes (note the scholion on line 40), and the prayer on behalf of Thebes in line 9 makes best sense if the performers have Theban sympathies (that condition would be satisfied by either a *χορός* of Thebans or Pindar himself). If we knew which eclipse this was, we would have a precise indication of the date of the song, which was probably composed soon afterwards. Unfortunately, we are not able to pinpoint it accurately. The only total solar eclipse during Pindar's poetic career was that of 30 April 463 BC. Another possibility is the anular eclipse of 17 February 478 BC. Pindar may have witnessed the eclipse of 28 April 509 BC, but he is unlikely to have been composing poetry this early.²

Composing a song or a prayer in response to an eclipse was not a new idea. From the library of Ashurbanipal in Nineveh survives a copy of a Babylonian ritual to be performed on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon (identified with the god Sin). The surviving section of the clay tablet begins with incipits of Sumerian cult lyrics, translated into Akkadian, which the priest who performs the ritual is to sing (*zamaru*). The theme of the songs is lamentation:³

¹ The gap is not certain, since triad length could be a multiple of column length.

² See Boll (1909), 2354–5; Mucke and Meeus (1983) (using astronomical dates, i.e. working with a year 0, so that e.g. 478 BC = -477).

³ Text in Clay (1923), no. 6; Ebeling (1931), 91–6; poems discussed in Krecher (1966), 24, 27. I thank Tonia Sharlach for help in tracking this down. Another Babylonian example is the prayer to Marduk composed by Shamash-shum-ukin in response to an eclipse of the moon in the early 7th century BC (Lutz (1919), no. 1;

... A man from Dilmun whose ship has gone under in the marshes am
 I,
 One who has a heart but no power; lament over my heart, over my soul!
 A sailing ship which brought gifts of bread brought also suffering;
 Full of gifts of bread, it did not bring them here; full of offerings, it did
 not bring them here.

Certainly, the solar eclipse was an established theme in Greek lyric poetry. According to Plut. *De fac. in orbe lun.* 931 E, eclipses were described by Mimnermus, Archilochus, Stesichorus, and Cydias (a poet of the late fifth century BC) as well as by Pindar.⁴ Some references to eclipses in lyric poetry may have been quite general, e.g. the celebrated fragment of Archilochus (*IEG* 122) in which a speaker says that Zeus can even make the sun disappear from the sky and create darkness at noon, as a means of making the general point that nothing is unexpected. But Stesichorus and Mimnermus may have witnessed the eclipses they mentioned: Stesichorus (*PMG* 271) perhaps the one of 28 May 585 BC, supposedly predicted by Thales; Mimnermus (*IEG* 20) either the same one, or that of 7 June 651 BC, or that of 6 April 647 BC (depending on when he lived). Cydias (*PMG* 715) may have described that of 30 March 433 BC.⁵

The song served the purpose of averting any catastrophe portended by the eclipse; it is probably at least partly in virtue of this apotropaic function that it was a *παιάν* (it may well have had a *παιάν* refrain expressing a prayer to Apollo for safety). This makes it all the stranger that in introducing the lines that he quotes from the song, Dionysius seems to be thinking not of *παιάνες* but of *διθύραμβοι* and *ὑπορχήματα*, although he stops short of implying that the song belongs to one of these genres.⁶ One might argue from this that he

cf. Ungnad (1943), 293–310: 'I, Shamash-shum-ukin . . . in the evil of an eclipse of the moon which has taken place in the month Kislimu, on the tenth day, in the evil of the powers, of the signs, evil and not good, which are in my palace and my country, I fear, I tremble, and I am cast down in fear!'

⁴ Stesichorus and Pindar are also linked as poets who mentioned eclipses in Pliny, *NH* 2. 12. 54. For possible sources see the testimonia.

⁵ The date of Cydias of Hermione (*ΣAr. Clouds*, 967) remains uncertain, but he was at least before Plato, who cites him at *Charm.* 155 D, and may be 6th cent. (Friis Johansen (1959), 12–13).

⁶ *Dem.* 142. 2–5 ταῦτα καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις, ἃ πολλὰ ἔστιν, εἰ λάβοι μέλη καὶ ῥυθμοὺς ὥσπερ οἱ διθύραμβοι καὶ τὰ ὑπορχήματα, τοῖς Πινδάρου ποιήμασιν εὐικένας δόξειεν ἂν τοῖς εἰς τὸν ἥλιον εἰρημένοις, ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ φαίνεται [followed by the Pindar quotation] ('These lines and many similar ones, if they were arranged in cola like the *διθύραμβοι*

had access to a tradition other than that represented by Π⁺ in which the song was classed not as a *Paian* but as a *Dithurambos* or a *Hup-orkhema*, but it more probably indicates that Dionysius is citing from memory and is not bothered with the details of the genre.⁷

The song opens with three questions. The first (τί . . . ἐμήσας;) is framed by three vocative phrases arranged in a rising tricolon: (1) ἀκτὶς ἀελίου; (2) πολύσκοπε . . . ὦ μάτερ ὀμμάτων; and (3) ἄστρον . . . κλεπτόμενον.⁸ Pindar emphasizes the idea of the sun as a source of light and therefore of vision, and seems less interested in the conventional representation as a charioteer.⁹ He makes the description symmetrical in so far as the sunlight is both a mother for human eyes and is also itself capable of sight (πολύσκοπε)—a symmetry which has the rhetorical function of creating common ground between deity and worshipper.¹⁰ Further common ground of the same type is suggested in the second question (〈τί δ'〉 ἐθηκας ἀμάχανον . . .;), which implies that the 'path of wisdom' (σοφίας ὁδόν—i.e. human wisdom) cannot survive without the sun's continued adherence to its established route.¹¹ The third (and shortest) question (ἐλαύνεις . . .;) has the secondary function of suggesting an alarming explanation for the eclipse: the sun may have adopted an entirely new course, which would presumably imply a permanent disruption of the previous order of things.

After the initial questions follows a prayer, introduced as often

and ὑπορχήματα, would seem to be like the poem of Pindar written to the sun, in my opinion').

⁷ The genre of Simonides' 'Danae' fragment (*PMG* 543) is not specified by Dionysius at *De comp. verb.* 141. 6 ff.

⁸ This interpretation is not certain, and many alternatives can be proposed: the typesetter suggests the possibility of internal accusative neuter plural πολύσκοπ' with the verb, while preferring vocative πολυσκόπ' 'far-seeing' (paroxytone by the usual rule, though cf. Chandler (1881), 139, on πολυ- compounds); Farnell (1930-2), ii. 413, took ἄστρον κλεπτόμενον as a participial clause governed by ἐμήσας; GH took the third colon as the subject of the next clause, but that seems unlikely.

⁹ Wilamowitz (1922), 394. The image of Helios driving his chariot is perhaps suggested in lines 5 and 7. There is an extended description of Helios driving a chariot in *HH* 31 (to the Sun), 9-16; on this and later hymns to Helios see Heitsch (1960).

¹⁰ For another example see p. 307.

¹¹ σοφίας ὁδόν occurs only here and at *C2*. 20 (perhaps its simple austerity was better suited to religious poetry than to the flamboyance of the *Epinikia*); there it suggests specifically poetic wisdom, but here it is the complement of physical strength. Becker (1937), 67 n. 47, compared fr. 108a and b, the thought in the first of which is that human success depends on divine guidance, in the second that gods can cause eclipses. Cf. also D. Bremer (1976), 257.

by ἀλλά.¹² The singer requests that the beam of the sun turn the common portent to the good of Thebes. Here the word for 'turn' (τράποιο) seems to pick up ἀτραπόν in line 5 ('a road that does not turn'), playing again on the metaphor of the path.¹³ The detail that the portent is πάγκοινων is perhaps there to suggest that since an eclipse manifests itself to many peoples, the evil that it portends need not apply to Thebes in particular. The vocative ἵπποσόα θεός (line 7) is part of the prayer, and is meant to suggest a desire on the part of the singer to see the sun resume its course.¹⁴

After a lacuna of two lines, the text resumes with a list of disasters which the eclipse might portend. It might be a sign of war, blight, snow, civil strife, flooding, freezing of the earth, a rainy summer, or cataclysm. These catastrophes are not arranged in any obvious order; human and natural disasters are woven together, though the last items in the list all have a connection with water. The regular structure of the syntax with objects linked by repetition of ἥ lends a solemn regularity.¹⁵

The epode begins with the statement that the singer can tolerate suffering which is shared. Nothing else survives from the epode, except a few fragments of scholia. How might the thought have developed from there? The singer might have gone on to say that he would be much more anxious if the catastrophe was confined to Thebes, perhaps because this would imply that this city had offended the gods in some way. Another possibility, leading on from the last lines of the antistrophe, is that he would have suggested that universal cataclysm might be part of a cosmic plan, and expressed the hope that the next generation of men would be better than the present one.

When the text resumes in the third line of the strophe of the second triad,¹⁶ the singer is talking about his performance: he states

¹² As at D6. 54; Aristonoos, παῖάν, 41 ff. See the discussions of Denniston (1954), 15–16; Meyer (1933), 18; Adami (1901), 234; Ausfeld (1903), 537.

¹³ See R. P. Martin (1983), 44–5. For etymological play involving words for 'path' see also Wyatt (1992), 116.

¹⁴ ἵπποσόα, ἵπποσόας are common in Pindar: of Artemis at *Ol.* 3. 26 and *Z7* (probably); also fr. 89a (of Artemis) θεῶν ἵππων ἐλάττειραν; *Pyth.* 2. 65; *Isth.* 5. 33. Now we have *POxy* 3876, fr. 1. 5 (Stesichorus).

¹⁵ One is reminded of the opening of the *Hymn to Zeus* (fr. 29). The structure is discussed by Bundy (1962), 45 n. 22.

¹⁶ Notice that this triad need not be the second and might be the third or a later one. It is impossible to be sure of the spacing because the length of the triad is almost exactly a multiple of the number of lines in a column.

(1) his motivation, describing himself as appointed by something divine (perhaps a sign);¹⁷ (2) his location, the child-bed of Melia, which must mean the Ismenion at Thebes;¹⁸ (3) the manner of his performance: linking voices by means of *αὐλός* and thought;¹⁹ and (4) the purpose is specified in the words *ὑμ[ε]τέραν χάριν* ('for your sake'), where *ὑμ[ε]τέραν* might refer to the Theban *χορός*, if the poet distinguishes himself from them, or the Thebans more generally; but it is more likely to refer to a group of deities including Apollo (cf. D5. 45), or even to Apollo alone, since *ὑμέτερος* can have a singular reference.²⁰ In favour of the last possibility is the consideration that it eases the transition to *ἐκαβόλε* in line 38. This suggests that the deities have already been referred to, perhaps in the missing first line of the strophe.

Line 38 seems to be a transition to the myth in the antistrophe. The asyndetic *λιτανεύω*, which corresponds metrically to *ίκετεύω* in line 8, probably refers to the long prayer of the first triad. For the first time in the extant text of the song the *χορός* invoke Apollo (by the epithet *ἐκαβόλος* in line 38, if not also by his name in line 40). In a participial clause, they describe themselves as consecrating the oracle to the arts of the Muses.²¹

The focus on the god and the oracle prepares the way for a narrative relating to the hero and seer Tenerus, who had connections with the Ismenion at Thebes and with Ptoion.²² His origins may have been in the so-called Teneric plain between Thebes and Mt Phikion to the west.²³ In versions of the myth known from later sources Apollo abducted Melia and slew her brother Caanthus when he

¹⁷ Wilamowitz (1922), 393 n. 2, suggested *δείματι* or *τέρατι*; I would suggest *σάματι*. For the use of *κραίνω* I would compare such Aeschylean compounds as *Πυθόκραντος* (*Ag.* 1255), *θεόκραντος* (*Ag.* 1488), *μοιρόκραντος* (*Cho.* 612; *Eum.* 392).

¹⁸ *λέχει* . . . *ἀμβροσίῳ* is similar to *λεχέων ἐπ' ἀμβρότων* in D6. 140. Melia is mentioned also at D7. 4.

¹⁹ For the instrumental datives see Hubbard (1987b), 2 n. 7.

²⁰ See *HH Herm.* 309–10; Solon, *IEG* 9. 2; Pind. D6. 139 (see D6 n. 71); Call. *Hy.* 4. 204, 227; Nonn. 5. 340–1; see Mineur (1984), 185, on Call. *Hy.* 4. 203.

²¹ So GH 108; Pindar reverses the 'natural' hierarchy of direct and indirect objects. For the alternative view that the dative expresses the instrument see Hubbard (1987b).

²² For 'Tenerus' Theban connections see Dr iii. 255. 1 ff. *προσκαλείται δὲ τὰς Θήβησιν ἡρωίδας εἰς τὸ Ἰσμήνιον ἦκεν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ τοῦ Τηνέρου ἱερόν ἐστι χρηστήριον* ('He summons the heroines of Thebes to come to the Ismenion, in which is the sacred oracle of Tenerus'). For his Ptoian connections see on D7.

²³ Paus. 9. 26. 1; Strabo 9. 2. 34, who cites Pind. fr. 51d for this connection (see below).

came to rescue her. Apollo and Melia had two sons, Tenerus, the seer, and Ismenus, who gave his name to the Theban river.²⁴ The surviving part of the narrative in A1 supplies only the beginning of a story: Melia bore Tenerus, and Apollo entrusted to him the city of Thebes.²⁵ When the text breaks off Pindar seems to be about to relate a myth illustrating Poseidon's admiration for Tenerus.²⁶ *συνέτεινε* presumably governed an object like *ἄρμα*, and refers to Poseidon, who comes to Euripus in order to cross to the mainland like Apollo in *HH Ap.* 222. The chances are that he comes from his shrine at Aegae in northern Euboea (as at *Nem.* 5. 37).

It has been suggested that a fragment of scholion contributed by A4 belongs here. The column of which this fragment contributes the bottom was thought by GH to be the one following line 49, while Wilamowitz thought it was the one ending at line 49.²⁷ At any rate, there is a possibility that in a subsequent stanza of A1 someone, presumably Tenerus, went to Aulis to prophesy to the local inhabitants.²⁸ Another possibility is that Poseidon's journey is just beginning and that he continued (like Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn*) to Thebes and Onchestos, where he had a famous cult: this would put us in the region of the Teneric plain. An aetiology for the name 'Teneric' would be as likely a subject for this song as any, and Poseidon's connection with the region, and his admiration for Tenerus, could perhaps have formed the basis for such an aetiology.²⁹

Strabo cites two lines of Pindar describing Tenerus (fr. 51b and 51d):

καί ποτε τὸν τρικάρανον
Πτωΐου κευθμῶνα κατέσχεθε κοῦ[ρος] (51b)
ναοπόλον μάντιν δαπέδοισιν ὁμοκλέα (51d)

²⁴ Paus. 9. 10. 5; for the full range of versions see Schachter (1967), 4.

²⁵ The transmitted reading is not metrical. Wilamowitz (1921), 490, suggested *στρατὸν ἄν*, which is awkward. Slater (1969a), xiv, defends the transmitted reading. I would suggest that a more radical transposition is in order: *τῷ* [Κάδμου Ζεάθου τε πολλὸν στρατὸν; cf. πολλὸν στρατὸν at D2. 75.

²⁶ *Ὀρσοτρίαινα* is the transmitted form at *Pyth.* 2. 12; *Ol.* 8. 14; *Nem.* 4. 86; *Ὀρσοτρίαινα* is to be preferred here on grounds of space and meaning. At Z9 *Ἰτρίαινα* could represent either form.

²⁷ GH 109; Wilamowitz (1922), 396 n. 2.

²⁸ There may be a reference to this in Z8.

²⁹ Pindar refers to Onchestus in two *Epinikia* (*Isth.* 4. 21; 1. 37) and in a *Partheneion* (fr. 94b. 46). Strabo, 9. 2. 33, seems to imply that Pindar mentioned it in fr. 51a ('Hymn to Ptoion').

([51b] And once the young man (?) took possession of the three-headed lair of Ptoios; [51d] a temple-dwelling seer with the same name as the plain.)

These are usually thought to come from the same song as the dactylo-epitrite fr. 51a, cited by Strabo just before, which seems to describe the foundation of a cult site by Apollo. But if, as has recently been suggested, frs. 51b and 51d do not have to come from the same song, there would be a chance that they come from A1.³⁰

The two triads do not cohere very well, and it almost seems as if an apotropaic *παιάν* has been welded on to a cult *παιάν* to Apollo and Tenerus. The problem of unity cannot be solved without the whole song. However, an important clue is that there was a tendency already in the fifth century BC to identify Apollo and the Sun. This comes out particularly from a passage in Euripides' *Phaethon* (*TGF* 781. 11–13), where Clymene invoked the Sun as 'destroyer' (i.e. *Ἀπόλλων~ἀπώλεσας*).³¹ And in the *Bassarides* Aeschylus represented Orpheus as having undergone a conversion from the worship of Dionysus to that of Apollo/Helios.³² Given the presupposition that Apollo and Helios are different aspects of the same divinity, it is natural that the Thebans would want to frame an apotropaic *παιάν* to the Sun as a cult hymn to Apollo.

The performance scenario may in fact have been a festival of Apollo at Thebes, perhaps the New Year festival that is the context for D1. This will presumably have taken place some time after the eclipse, giving time for the commission, composition, and rehearsal of the song. It seems highly unlikely that its performance coincided with the eclipse; although the art of predicting eclipses seems to have been already known to Thales of Miletus in the sixth century BC (probably borrowed from the Babylonians), it does not seem to have been widely practised; in any case, the opening of the song

³⁰ Wagman (1986); the metre would appear not to suit D7 anything like as well.

³¹ Lines 224–6 in Diggle (1970).

³² See ps.-Eratosth. *Catast.* in *MG* iii/1. 29–30 ed. Olivieri (= *TrGF* iii. 178–9); West (1983), 63 ff. See also Wernicke (1895), 19–21; O. Jessen, *RE* s.v. *Helios*, xv. 75 ff.; Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 302; Schauenburg (1955), 12, 49 n. 18; Hunter (1986), 52 and n. 17. An equation between Apollo and Helios has sometimes been supposed at Aesch. *Su.* 212–14, but see Johansen and Whittle (1980), ii. 172. Men. *Rh.* 1. 5. 2 with 1. 2. 2 (=28 A 20 DK, 31 A 23 DK) suggests that Parmenides and Empedocles wrote hymns in which Apollo and Helios were identified. See also Plato, *Laws*, 945 B; and *OF* on fr. 172; Wilamowitz (1920), i. 416 n. 3.

does not give one the impression that this eclipse was predicted or prepared for.³³

The opening of the song could well be imitated in the first words of the parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone* (100 ff.), in which on the morning after the defeat of the Seven the χορός celebrate the Theban victory:

ἀκτὶς ἀελίου, τὸ κάλ-
 λιστον ἑπταπύλῳ φανέν
 Θήβῃ τῶν προτέρων φάος,
 ἐφάνθης ποτ' ὦ χρυσέας
 ἀμέρας βλέφαρον, Διρκαί-
 ων ὑπὲρ ῥέεθρων μολοῦσα,
 τὸν †λεύκασπιν Ἀργόθεν
 φῶτα βάντα πανσαγία†
 φυγάδα πρόδρομον ὀξύτόρῳ
 κινήσασα χαλινῶ.

(Beam of the sun, light that appears to seven-gated Thebes the fairest ever light, O eyelid of the golden day, you have revealed yourself at last, moving over the streams of Dirke, making the white-shielded man who came from Argos in full panoply run away, pulling sharply on the steed's bit.)

The Theban setting of A1 makes it an appropriate model.³⁴ One could perhaps see thematic relevance also: while Pindar makes the beam of the sun ἱπποσῶα θοάς, so Sophocles has the sun drive the enemy away like a horse-rider in flight. Again, in the second triad of the *Paian* Pindar moves away from the eclipse and focuses on Apollo and his seer Tenerus, and it may be observed that one of the major figures in Sophocles' *Antigone* is another Theban seer, Teiresias, whose advice is ignored. I would suggest that we should also consider lines 13 ff. of the *Paian* in this context: some of the calamities Pindar mentions are relevant in the *Antigone*, particularly στάσιν οὐλομένην ('deadly faction') in line 15. A final point: what would otherwise be a fairly straightforward dark allusion is complicated by the fact that the parodos of the *Antigone* can itself be thought

³³ Thales: Her. 1. 74. Greek knowledge of eclipses in the 5th century BC: Boll (1909), 2341 ff.

³⁴ See Mueller (1967), 47; Garner (1990), 181, appendix B, who has shown that the beginning is a favoured place for allusions. A remoter possibility is that Soph. *Ant.* 100 and A1. 1 have a common model. Similar too is the opening of Eur. *Pho.* (which I take to be lines 3 ff. of the transmitted text: see Haslam (1975) and, with a contrasting viewpoint, van der Valk (1982)).

of as a *παιάν*, though this would be a celebratory victory *παιάν*, contrasting with the fearful and apotropaic song of Pindar.

A2 (*Pa. X(a)*)

..]κε[
 καὶ χ[
 ἐνάτῃ[εἰς ποταμόν τινα,
 Στυγὶ σύνδετον,
 5 βέν[
 ἄσας σῆ[...δαῖ]ξομ[ένων
 col. 2 γναμπτ[
 ψαντες αἰ[
 πατήρ δεπ[
 10 καὶ χρυσο[
 ἀγήσεται· τ[
 πολιάοχ[ο
 ἀστοῖσι τε[
 ξενοκαδ[
 — τακ[
 16 εστα[
 ἐμόν τ[
 τὴν μέν[πά]ρ μιν μ[
 ἐμὴν δὲ πα[ρ] κείνοισ[ς
 20 ζευχθεῖσα π[ρ]οβώμ[ιος
 υἱὸν ἔτι τέξ[ε]· τὸν ἀπ[
 κλυτομάντιες τῷ δ[

Π⁴ fr. 129–31; the reconstructed text represents the left side of the lower part of one column of Π⁴ (fr. 129) plus the left side of the next column (fr. 131)

3 ENAT[5 βεν[θ GH 6 Sn from Σ 12 ἈΟΧ 20 ΒΩΜ
 21 Π[or Τ[

Σ 1 (Σ⁶²) [< 35] Ἀλεξαν- [< 35] .s χρυ- [< 25] .κα...[...].[...]
 ακοντα | [< 10] ἐνναε[τηρίδο(s) καὶ τοῦτον καίεσθαι | [< 25] ρ[.]ν δὲ-
 ναι εἶναι κ[.]ινα δις αὐ- [< 25] .[.] ἀλιτήριον |
 (Σ^{δ1}) [< 5] π[.] .[~12] μ[.]... δια τοῦ ε ἔσται | [< 5] λε |

[< 5] λουσ[~10 δύν]αται καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα || 3 ff. ὄρ]κου γὰρ δ[εινοῦ
Σ]τυγὸς ὕδ(ατος) (Hom. *Il.* 2. 755). "τινα" λέγει Πηνειόν·

(Σ^{ε2}) ["σ]ύνδετ[ο]ς" λ[έγετα]ι [ὅτ]ι ἔσχε συνάφειαν τῷ Τιταρησίῳ, [ὅς α] πόρ-
ροισιν ἀπὸ Στυγὸς ἔχει, ὡς κ[α]ὶ "Ὀμηρος λέγει ||

6 and beneath the column (Σ^{δ1})]λλ | ἐνναετ[ηρὶς] . . . [.] . τ () Ἄρι[(στόνι-
κος?) ~18]ν ὡς διὰ εἰ[τ]ῶν | ἀπομερισθησομένων τ. [~20 κ]αὶ ἀγι-
σθησο[μ]ένων ||

7 (above column) . [. < 35]

(Σ^{ε2}) [?]αλλ[. < 35]

(Σ^{δ1}) εμ[.] ἰδο[< 35 | τῆς μι[< 35] | λέγετα[ι < 35]

3 ff. Snell (1938)

6 διὰ εἰ: διὰ θ (?) GH

18 ff.: . . . for you to him/her . . . but to me among them . . . being yoked in
front of the altar she/you will bear a son; he . . . the (?) of famous seers . . .

(1) Alexander . . . *ennaeteris* and (he says) this is burnt . . . can be . . . twice . . .
offender. . . with the ε, will be . . . (3 ff.) 'Of the terrible oath of the water of the
Styx' (Hom. *Il.* 2. 755). By 'a certain' he means the Peneius. 'Bound together' is used
because it had contact with the Titaessus, which flows from the Styx, as Homer
says. (6 and beneath the column) *ennaeteris* . . . Aristonicus . . . in order at intervals
of five years to be divided and consecrated. (7 above column) . . . it is said . . .

A2 is an enigma. It offers several tantalizing clues, but it is hard
to combine them into a coherent interpretation. Scholia on lines 1
and 6 refer to an enneaeteric festival, that on line 6 also seems to
refer to a penteteric festival. It is hard not to relate these to ἐνάτῃ in
line 3 of the text. GH initially suggested that the enneaeteric
festival might be the Theban Daphnephoria.¹ They may have been
influenced by the reference to Thebans in A3, which seems to come
from the same section of the papyrus as A2, but need not come from
the same song.²

Against this interpretation, Bruno Snell convincingly argued for
the Delphic Septerion. This was an important Delphic festival with
three stages: first, a young man, both of whose parents were still
alive (ἀμφιθαλής), burnt a hut built on the threshing-floor (ἄλως);
then he led a procession to Tempe in Thessaly, where he was ritually
purified of the crime by washing in the River Peneius; and finally, he
led the procession back to Delphi carrying laurel-branches plucked
from the vale of Tempe.³ There are several points in favour of

¹ Theban Daphnephoria: Procl. *Chrest.* 321^b32–322^a13; Paus. 9. 10. 4; Burkert
(1985), 100, 387; Schachter (1981–5), i. 83 ff.

² GH never explicitly say this. Snell also assumed that the two were from the
same song. Turyn, however, places A3 on its own (= fr. 61).

³ Snell (1938), 439. Sources for the Septerion (not Stepterion, despite Blech

Snell's analysis. First, *καίεσθαι* in the scholion on line 2 could refer to the burning of the hut. Second, we find at Delphi both an eight-year cycle (Septerion) and a four-year cycle (Puthia); confusion might have arisen if every second celebration of the Pythian games was linked to the Septerion, and the scholiast may be trying to sort things out.⁴

Thirdly, and most important, a further scholion to line 3 refers to the River Peneius, citing Hom. *Il.* 2. 755 from the end of the description of how the Titaressus flows into the Peneius, but does not mix with it because it flows from the Styx.⁵ These scholia pick up *Στυγί* in line 4, also perhaps *βενί* in line 5, which could refer to the depths of a river. Finally, *ἀγήσεται* (line 11) would also fit the Septerion if its subject is the *ἀμφιθαλὴς κούρος* who led the procession back to Delphi.⁶ All things considered, the identification seems secure, and A2 turns out to be our earliest source for the Delphic Septerion.

If this is right, it incidentally helps to settle a point about the early history of the festival. Plutarch (*De def. or.* 418A) regarded the Septerion as a *μίμησις* of Apollo's journey to Thessaly to atone for killing the Delphic dragon by offering sacrifice in the River Peneius. It has been argued that this association is not ancient, and that it was perhaps introduced by Ephorus, who took the burning of the hut in the first stage of the Septerion as evidence for his Euhemerizing interpretation of the Pythoconia.⁷ But A2 is good evidence that the myth of the Septerion was linked with the Peneius

(1982), 224 and n. 41: cf. Hesych. iv. 22 Schmidt) are Plut. *De def. or.* 417E–418D; *Qu. Gr.* 293C; Ephorus, *FGRH* 70 F 31 (=Strabo, 9. 3. 12); Theopompus, *FGRH* 115 F 80 (Ael. *VH* 3. 1); Burkert (1983), 127–30; Jeanmaire (1939), 387–411; Blech (1982), 224 ff.; Simon (1953), 26 ff.; Defradas (1954), 98 ff.; F. Pfister, *RE* s.v. *Septerion*, ivA. 1553 ff.

⁴ The fact that before 586 BC the Pythian Games were enneacteric (Dr ii. 4. 14; Cens. *De die natali*, 18. 6; ΣHom. *Od.* 3. 267, i. 143. 17 Dindorf) suggests that originally Puthia and Septerion always coincided. Burkert (1983), 130 n. 77, infers that the Septerion took place 'shortly before' the Pythian Games by combining Plut. *De def. or.* 410A (the dialogue is said to take place 'shortly before' the Pythian Games) and 418A (Delphi *ἄρτι* initiated all the Greeks west of Thermopylae into the mysteries of the Septerion and extended the rites as far as Tempe). However, it is impossible to be sure how much time is implied by *ἄρτι*.

⁵ The last line is also used of the Cocytus at Hom. *Od.* 11. 514. On non-mixing of the Titaressus see Pelliccia (1990).

⁶ We find *ἀγέομαι* in a ritual context at fr. 94b. 67.

⁷ Halliday (1928), 70–1, on Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 293C; Burkert (1983), 129, seems to side with Halliday. The main ancient source is Ephorus, *FGRH* 70 F 31b (=Strabo,

at least as early as Pindar.⁸ Furthermore, the surviving fragment of the song sheds light on one detail of Pindar's articulation of the myth: for him one factor which made the Peneius a suitable instrument of purification must have been its chthonic affiliation. The rationale behind this is perhaps that the Delphic dragon was an agent of the chthonic sphere (cf. H2, which might come from this song), so that it is to a chthonic symbol that reparation had to be paid for its death.⁹

The last four lines seem to be a part of a genealogical prophecy.¹⁰ A woman is going to be impregnated or give birth to a son in front of an altar ($\pi[\rho]οβώμ[ι]ος$ in line 20), as Melia bore Tenerus in the shrine at Thebes according to A1. 40–1 or as Auge bore Telephus in the shrine of Athena at Tegea, or Aigle Asclepius in Isyllus' account of the god's birth.¹¹ We do not know for sure whether she is referred to in the third person or the second (which would make her identical with the $τῖν$ of line 18), since $τέξ[ε]!$ could be either third-person singular of the active future or the second-person singular of the middle future.¹² The birth is going to happen in a place different

9. 3. 12). At Plut. *De def. or.* 418 A Cleombrotus says that the hut does not look like a snake's hole but represents a royal dwelling.

⁸ See Simon (1953), 33 ff.; the iconographical evidence she cites for Apollo as sacrificer need have nothing to do with the Septerion.

⁹ Simon (1953), 33 ff., suggested that Apollo's purifying himself in a river 'bound with the Styx' symbolizes (1) the reverence of Olympian gods for chthonic powers (comparing the oath of the Styx in Hes. *Th.* 775–806) and (2) reconciliation between the Olympian and chthonic spheres (Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 291 with Braswell (1988), 390, and fr. 35; Aesch. *Prometheus Lyomenos*, *TGrF* iii. 190–3). Brelich (1969), 426, argues that the infernal character of the Peneius makes it suitable as a place of segregation for initiants. On the Septerion as an initiation ritual see also Jeanmaire (1939), 388 ff.; Calame (1977a), 191 ff.

¹⁰ Führer (1967), 110, 125. In his analysis genealogical prophecies generally (1) include the identity of the divine parent involved and (2) announce the birth of the son, adding also his name (2a), upbringing (2b), and conspicuous qualities (2c), sometimes with reference to further descendants (3). With respect to A2, he supposes that stage (2) is represented by line 21 and stage (2b) by $τὸν ἀπ[ὸ] κλυτομάντιες τῷ δ[ι]$ in lines 21–2. The future tense of $ἀγήσεται$ in line 11 makes it likely that lines 11–21 belong to the same speech. For indications of prophecies see S2. 13 ff.; C3. 5 (perhaps). A prophecy concerning his sons may have been delivered to Erginus towards the end of B, and it would not be surprising if D7 or A1 included (ended with?) a genealogical prophecy concerning Tenerus.

¹¹ *ΣAr. Frogs*, 1080 (*Schol. Ar.* iv/3. 1020), referring to the *Auge* of Euripides (= *TGF* 436, perhaps), which must therefore have dealt with the birth of Telephus in the shrine. See Webster (1967), 239; Koenen (1969). Isyllus, F48 (for the sections of this inscription, see p. 145).

¹² The only other form of the future of $τίκτω$ in Pindar—at *Pyth.* 9. 59—is

from the one now occupied by the speaker, to judge from lines 18 ff., which means somewhere other than Delphi, if that is the location of the speaker. The son is probably going to be a seer: that would be a likely hypothesis in a *Paian* anyway, and it is made virtually certain by the mention of seers (κλυτομάντιες in line 22, with a noun understood),¹³ who are presumably going to raise him or receive him in some way.¹⁴ The speaker is probably a god: although in exceptional cases genealogical prophecies can be delivered by seers or mythological characters other than gods, it is generally gods who utter them.¹⁵ What makes it almost certain that the speaker is a god in this case is that the prophecy involves the speaker (ἐμὸν in line 17, ἐμὴν in line 19),¹⁶ in which respect compare Poseidon's prophecy to Tyro at Hom. *Od.* 11. 248 ff. (=Hes. fr. 31) and Aphrodite's to Anchises at *HH Aphr.* 196 ff., 296 ff. Prophecies by mythological characters other than gods never involve the speaker, so far as I am aware. If the speaker is a god, it is most likely to be Apollo in a Delphic context. Since there is no sign in the preceding line of either an introductory speech-frame or the opening of a speech, it is likely that the whole of A2 is from a speech by Apollo.

One possibility is that the speech was made by Apollo after he returned from purifying himself in the Peneius.¹⁷ In the surviving fragment he perhaps founds the festival, saying that every ninth year (line 3) a young man must purify himself in the Peneius (line

middle. Otherwise, active and middle are about equally common in early Greek poetry: Braswell (1988), on *Pyth.* 4. 52.

¹³ The epithet κλυτομάντιες also occurs at D6. 2, and we find a similar expression at B2. 1; it seems to be peculiar to Delphi. The meaning at D6. 2 is κλυτὰ μάντεσι; here it may amount to κλυτοὶ μάντιες ὄντες. Epithets in -μαντιες are particularly common in Aeschylus; prosody ruled it out for epic. There is a parallel with the Sanskrit *śrutarsi* (*śruta rsi* 'seer in the sacred law'), an instance of the high degree of parallelism between Greek and Indian poetic terminology for the idea of fame: see Schmitt (1967).

¹⁴ Führer (1967), 125, suggested rearing, but that is unlikely if the son is born in another place.

¹⁵ See Führer (1967), 124–5. Genealogical prophecies are spoken by prophets at Corinna, *PMG* 654. iii. 22 ff.; *Isth.* 6. 52 ff. (Heracles); *Pyth.* 9. 39 ff. (Cheiron).

¹⁶ For the dialectical form ἐμὴν see §18 n. 4.

¹⁷ Evidence that Pindar recounted the purification of Apollo may perhaps be found in Tert. *De cor.* 7. 5 (CCSL ii. 1049 = Pind. fr. 249a Schr.; cf. Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 89) 'habes tragoediam †Cerberi, habes Pindarum atque Callimachum, qui et Apollinem memorat interfecto Delphine dracone lauream induisse, qua supplicem'. But it seems likely that the story of Apollo and the laurel is being attributed to Callimachus only; what is attributed to Pindar is lost in the corruption, but it may refer to something said about Cerberus and a crown in *Dith.* II (fr. 70b).

4) and lead the procession back (line 11) for the sake of Delphi (13–14). He also perhaps announces that he will father a son, who will be reared or received by the seers of Delphi (18 ff.). Whom he is addressing in line 18 is not clear. It might be the mother (see above), or it might be another divinity, perhaps Athena, who led Apollo back from Thessaly according to the *παιάν* of Aristonoos. Or it might be a mortal, such as Chrysothemis of Crete, who purified Apollo after the Pythoctionia according to the ancient hypothesis to the *Pythians* (Dr ii. 4. 10).¹⁸ If A3 belongs to the same song, it may provide the identity of the son.

A3 (Pa. X(b))

	[Καστάλιον,]
	[Ἰκάδιος,]
]]
]]
5]]
]ν ὁμώνυμο[
]s

Π⁴ fr. 134

Σ 1 (Σ^{δ1}) [~? Κ]αστάλιον φ[~?] | [~? ε]στω δ' Ἀπόλλω[< 25? |

Between lines 2 and 3 (Σ^{δ2}) Ἰκάδ[ιο < 25]

3 (Σ^{δ1}) [~? κ]αὶ Ἄνδρων ἐκ Δι[< 25] | [~?]ι^τ ἐκ δὲ Κρήτης
σ[< 25]

5 [~? ο]ἱ Δελφοί, ὅθεν καὶ κ[< 25]

7 (after]s) Θηβαίοις προσ[< 25]

9 [< 5]ος/Εἰκάδιος Ἀρίσ(ταρχος) . [< 15]

11]ν

3 e.g. ἐκ Δι[ός, ἐκδι[- ? 9 / is an entry-divider: McNamee (1992), 17–18
Ἀρίσ(ταρχος) GH, McNamee (1981)

(6) with the same name

(1) Kastalios, it is [an epithet] of Apollo . . . (between lines 2 and 3) Ikadios . . .
and Andron from . . . from Crete . . . (5) The Delphians, from where also: . . . for
the Thebans . . . Eikadios Aris[tarchus]

¹⁸ For Chrysothemis see p. 102.

All that survives of the text here is the word *δμώνυμο*[ι, though we can also probably restore the lemma *Ἰκάδ[ι*ο in line 2, and perhaps also *Κ[αστάλιον* in line 1. *Ἰκάδ[ι*ο (the form is Doric)¹ could be an epithet of Apollo,² but what the scholiast may be saying is that according to Andron (of Halicarnassus) Delphi or the Delphians received someone from Crete,³ and we happen to know from elsewhere that the Delphic hero Eikadios was supposed to have started from Crete.⁴ *Κ[αστάλιον* in line 1 of the fragment could also be an epithet of Apollo (otherwise poorly attested)⁵ or the Delphic hero of that name.⁶ Since Kastalios and Eikadios were both names of seers and epithets of Apollo, the word *δμώνυμο*[may have applied to Delphic heroes and seers, and its force may have been that some of them shared a name with Apollo.

The fragment is similar in appearance to A2, and if the two come

¹ The lemma in line 3 seems to indicate that the scholiast's text read *Ἰκάδιος*, while Aristicus (?) read *Εἰκάδιος* according to line 10. SnMae have taken the latter as the true reading, but the Doric form *Ἰκάδιος* (cf. *ΦΙΚΑΔΙΩ* in an inscription from Mantinea, *IG* v/2. 271. 8) cannot be excluded. The supplement *Εἰκ[άδιος* is possible in B7.

² See *EM* 298. 1 *Εἰκάδιος ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰκάς εἰκάδος, εἰκάδιος. ἔστι δὲ ὄνομα κύριον. ἐν τῇ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνὸς ἑορτὴ ἐπετελεῖτο τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι· καὶ ἐλέγετο ἡ ἱέρεια εἰκάς. ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἑορτῇ ἐγεννήθη, λέγεται Εἰκάδιος* ('Eikadios is from *εἰκάς, εἰκάδος* ["twentieth"], and it is a proper noun. On the twentieth of the month the feast of Apollo was held, and the festival was called "the Twentieth". He was called "Eikadios" because he was born on this day'). O. Jessen, *RE* s.v. x. 2098, finds evidence for the equation of Apollo with Eikadios in the Arcadian king-list preserved in *ΣEur. Or.* 1646 (i. 237. 15 Schwartz), where Dorieus is said to be the son of Eikadios and Koroneia, whom he takes as doublets of Apollo and Koronis. An Attic guild of the *Εἰκαδεῖς* set up their plaque in the shrine of Parnassian Apollo (*IG* ii/2. 1258, Ziebarth (1896), 38, 182); cf. Rutherford (1990), 173 n. 14; Bacch. fr. *20B. 5.

³ Addenda 10 F 20 in *FGrH* 1; Wilamowitz (1922), 87–8. Compare Andron's etymology of *Παρνασσός* from the *λαρνασσός* or *λάρναξ* of Deucalion that came to rest there: *FGrH* 10 F 8.

⁴ According to a version attributed to Cornificius Longus by Servius on *Aen.* 3. 332 (Thilo and Hagen (1881–1902), i. 401. 3), a certain Iapys and Icadus both started out from Crete, Iapys going to Italy and Icadus to Delphi by dolphin. In Servius' own version, given immediately before this, Eikadios, son of Apollo and Lycia and founder of Patara, founded Delphi after being shipwrecked near Mt Parnassus ('Ikadios' is unjustifiably altered to 'Lycadius' by Stocker and Travis (1965), 3).

⁵ So Jacoby; the epithet is found in a hexameter *παιάν* preserved in a magical papyrus, *PGM* 2. 245 = R111.

⁶ According to one tradition, he was a Cretan who set out to found a colony and was led to Delphi by Apollo in the form of a dolphin: *EM* 255. 17, s.v. *Δελφίνιος*; *ΣLyc.* 208 (97. 24 Scheer); according to Paus. 10. 6. 4, he was a native of Delphi and had a daughter Thyia, who instituted the worship of Dionysus.

from the same song, then Kastalios or Eikadios might be the son whose birth is prophesied in the genealogical prophecy.

But for the position, the phrase *Θηβαίοις προσ* in line 7 of the scholia would suggest a song-title (see D'Alessio (1997), 31).

A4

(Σ^{δ2}) [~?], πο[~10] | [~?] ρ() καὶ [εἰ]ς τὸν τῆς Αὐλίδος
πο[ρθμόν ~?] | [~? τοῖς] τὴν Αὐλίδα κατοικοῦσιν μαντεύε[σθαι ~?]

A5

(Σ^δ) [~? ποτ]αμόν [τ'] Ἰσμ[ηνὸν ~?] | | | (Σ^ε) [~?] σ καὶ

A6

(Σ^δ) [< 20] τοσ Ἰσμ[ην < 20] | |

A4 Π⁴ fr. 139

A5 Π⁴ fr. 138

A6 Π⁴ fr. 161

A4. 2 *Εὔριπ*ο() GH

A4 . . . and to the strait of Aulis (?) . . . to prophesy to those dwelling in Aulis (?)

A5 the River Ismenus (?) A6 Ismenus (?)

Any or all of these fragments of scholia could refer to A1. Aulis is also mentioned in Z8.

A7

(Σ^δ)] | [~? άρ]πάξειν[~?] | |

Π⁴ fr. 81

. . . to seize . . .

A7 is reminiscent of a scholion on *Nem.* 7. 42–3 (Dr iii. 125. 10): *φασὶ τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου θύοντος τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀρπάζειν τὰ θύματα* ('They say they when Neoptolemus was sacrificing, the Delphians seized the offerings'). Since the assignation to Group A (section D) is uncertain (so GH), perhaps it should be assigned to D6. 121–2.

Group B

B1 (Pa. VIIId)

Π ⁴ col. 1]]ενο[]μεσ[
	* *	* (perhaps a line missing)	
	.ασ[3
	ομ[
5	τιτ[
	κα[6
	δ[
	λομ[~13] . λ[.] ι[
	σφ[9
10	μεγ[~13] . ν δ' ἔπος		
⁵ Π ⁴	κλιθε[. [] . κο[~7] σφίσιν		
⁵ Π ⁴	μάλα πρᾶξον [δι]καίως		12

Π⁴ fr. 83 + fr. 84. 1-12

10 π]ᾱν GH 11 λ[or χ according to SnMae, but ι (GH) seems possible. There may be a sublinear hyphen beneath this letter ἐκο[ινάσατο] Turyn 12 ΡΑΞ Π⁴

10 (Σ^{δ1}) ᾱντ(ι τοῦ) πᾱσα[ν τήν ἀλήθειαν < 20]

10 GH

10 ff. A word . . . to them . . . do very justly (?).

Instead of 'all the truth'.

What used to be regarded as part of B2 has turned out to be the end of a different song. κλιθε[in line 11 could perhaps represent a form of the aorist passive of κλίνω, possibly governed by ἔπος. In the last line πρᾱξον could be an imperative and part of the content of the ἔπος, or a future participle agreeing with ἔπος.¹ The

¹ So Förstel (1972), 98 ff.; Bona (1988), 188-9; D'Alessio (1991), 100; Führer (1967), 147, took πρᾱξον in line 12 as a future participle rather than an imperative, following GH.

second seems awkward, and there are two positive points in favour of the former: first, as D'Alessio pointed out, *πῶσσε δίκαια* ('do just things') is a moral maxim attested in a long list of maxims from Miletopolis in Turkey, which may well be Delphic in origin.² (The aorist imperative *πᾶξον* could imply a general exhortation, despite the usual association of the aorist with single acts.³) Second, the deployment of a moral gnome is a standard way for Greek lyric poets to end songs.⁴

B2 (*Pa.* VIII)

str. A

]οις [≠] *Κλυτοὶ μάντι[ες] Ἀπόλλωνος*
 [εἰς Πυθῶ] [ἐ]γὼ μὲν ὑπέρ χθονὸς
 [ὑ]πέρ τ' ὠκεανοῦ

Π⁴ col. 2 *Θέμιδος τ' ἐπι[*

(lacuna comprising lines 5–37 of the first triad, lines 1–13 of the penultimate triad, and any triads in between)

ant. c? [— — — — —
 .λ[— — — —
 εχ[— — — —

90? *δια[— — — — ⊗*

— — () — σκολ[⊗ — — — — ⊗]

3

*ὀξυ[— — — — —]**χαμ[— — — — ⊗]**οὔτι[— — — — ⊗]*

6

95? .[— — — — —


*φν[— — — — ⊗**.λ[. (.) — — — —]*[] *πετ[— — — — —]*

9

² *SIG* 1268, i. 13; D'Alessio (1991), 100; taken as of Delphian origin by Pfeiffer (1952), 70 n. 41.

³ The use of an aorist imperative in a general order is problematic, but differences of aspect in imperatives may not always have been of significance; see Moorhouse (1982), 217. Bakker (1966) argues that the use of a present imperative implies that the order must be obeyed at once, whereas the use of an aorist imperative implies that it can be obeyed at any time. On the possible signification of this order, see p. 172.

⁴ *Ol.* 3, *Ol.* 5, and *Nem.* 11 end with moral gnomes. Rutherford (1997b), 51, puts these in the context of a general study of Pindaric endings. Similar endings in Horace are discussed by Esser (1976), 130 ff.

- ep. c? τυ. [
- Π⁴ col. 11-5 = 8? 100? ναόν· τὸν μὲν Ὑπερβορ[έοις
 ἄνεμος ζαμενῆς ἔμ(ε)ιξ[3
 ὦ Μοῖσαι, το(ῦ) δὲ παντέχ[νοις
 Ἀφαιστου παλάμαις καὶ Ἀθά[νας
 τίς ὁ ῥυθμὸς ἐφαίνετο; 6
 105? χάλκεοι μὲν τοῖχοι χάλκ[εαί
 θ' ὑπὸ κίονες ἕστασαν,
 χρύσειαι δ' ἐξ ὑπὲρ αἵετοῦ
 ἄειδον Κηληδόνες. 9
 109? ἀλλὰ μιν Κρόνον· παῖ[δες
 [] κεραυνῷ χθόν' ἀνοιξάμ[ε]ν[ο]ι
 ἔκρυψαν τὸ [π]άντων ἔργων ἱερώτ[ατον] 12
- str. D? γλυκείας ὁπὸς ἀγασ[θ]έντες
 ὅτι ξένοι ἔφ[θ](ι)νον
 ἄτερθεν τεκέων
- 115? ἀλόχων τε μελ[ι]φρονι
- Π⁴ col. 11-4 = 9? αὐδ[ᾶ θυ]μὸν ἀνακρίμναντες· επε[3
 λυσίμβροτον παρθενία κε[
 ἀκηράτων δαίδαλμα [
 ἐνέθηκε δὲ Παλλὰς ἀμ[6
 120? φωνᾶ τά τ' ἐόντα τε κα[ὶ
 πρόσθεν γεγεννημένα
 ~5]ται Μναμοσύνα[
 []παντα σφιν ἔφρα[σ.ν 9
- ant. D? ~]αιον δόλον ἀπνευ[~
- 125? ~-]. γὰρ ἐπὴν πόνο[ς
 ~--]. ἀρετα[]
 ~~-] καθαρὸν δ[ι.]. [
 --[-~~⊗]ουτ' ὀξύτατον[3
 --~]. αινᾶς ἀδα[
 130? ~-~]. ὥπου· ἵναο[
 ~~-]σαφές ευ. [6
- Π⁴ col. 11-3 = 10? ~6]ν. . [
 ~]αχω. [
 134? ~6].ει. [

[] ~6] . ω . [

ep. D? ~6] α σ . [

140? --- ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ἐπὶ Θήβας
 ξίφος ἐλκόμενον ~ ~

142?] νῖ

Π⁴

col. η-2 = 11? 148?

B2 is restored from four papyri: the first section is Π⁴⁵ fr. 5. 2-6 and Π⁴ fr. 83 + fr. 84. 13-15; perhaps also Π²⁶ fr. 23; of the longer second section lines 88-103 (assuming a poem of four triads) are contributed by Π²⁸ fr. 2; lines 100-18 by Π⁶; lines 103-7 by Π⁴ fr. 90; lines 104-36 by Π²⁶ fr. 22; lines 109-12 by Π⁴ fr. 87; lines 116 ff. by Π⁴ fr. 143; the content of lines 137-48 is recovered from Π⁴ fr. 82 col. 1 and Π²⁶ fr. 29 (Σ). Galen cites lines 70-1 in his discussion of Hípp. *De artic.* 43 (xviii/1. 518-19K). References to the myth of the four temples are found in Paus. 10. 5. 12; Arist. fr. 3 Rose; Strabo 9. 3. 9; Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 6. 11 (see appendix following the commentary below). Pindar's *Κηληδόνας* are mentioned by Athen. 290 E

Title (Π⁴⁵ in text) Δελ[φ]οις Mac 1 $\frac{1}{2}$. [| [| κ[in Π²⁶ fr. 23 (if this belongs here) 4 Θέμιδος, GH from Σ in Π⁴ τ' ἐπ[Π⁴⁵ ἐπ[κα Mac, comparing Σ; e.g. ἐπὶ κά[πους? 91 σκολ[οπ Di Benedetto ap. D'Alessio (1991) 93 χαμ[αί Di Benedetto ap. D'Alessio (1991) 95-6 δα-]φν[α Sn 97 perhaps BA[Sn 98 πετ[εινών after 98 παράγραφος added by Sn 99 ἰ or T Γ[I, ἰνγ[γ Sn (cf. Philostr. *V4* 6. 11), but cf. Dickie (1997) 100 Hunt 101 ἐμε[ι]ξ[ε συν ὑμῖν Sn 102 Μοῖσαι Π τοῦ Hunt: τον Π παντέχ[νοις Hunt: παντέχ[νου Körte (1923) 103, 105 Hunt 107 ἐξυπερ Schr (1923); ἐξυπερ Wackernagel (1957) ΑΕΤΟΥ Π⁶ 109 MIN Π⁶; NIN Π²⁶ Lobel 111 Π⁶Π²⁶Π⁶: ἔργον Π⁶Π²⁶Π⁶ ιερῶτ[ατον Hunt 112 Sn TEC Π⁴ 113 Lobel: [] YNON Π 115 μελ[ί]φροσι αὐδ[ᾱ in the same line Π²⁶; to avoid the hiatus Sn suggested a period-end or emendation to μελίφροσιν αὐδαῖς; μελίφρον' (i.e. -φρονα) would avoid hiatus (cf. ps.-Hes. *Aspis*, 428, Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 168. 25), but the epithet belongs with the focal αὐδ[ᾱ 116 Suppl. Lobel]C: ἘΠΕ or 'Ε Π⁴ Ε[or O[Π⁴ ἐπέ[ων δέ Sn (1962) (cf. fr. 94b (*Parth.* II), 31-2]δαυδάλλοισ' ἔπεισαν); ἐπέ[ιτα, ἐπέ[μφοθ δ' ὑπὸ γὰν, ἐπέ[το μὰν ὑπὸ γὰν, or ἐπέ[το δ' οὐ Försstel (1972) 117]ΑΙΚΕ[Π⁴: Ε[perhaps O[Π²⁶ κε[φαλᾷ, κε[λαδῆσει? Sn; κε[λάδησαν Ferrari (1992a) 118 ΔΑΙΔ [μένεν e.g. Sn 119 ἀμ[οιβάν? Sn; ἀμ[βρόταν/ἀμ[βροσίαν σοφίαν κοράν | φωνᾷ Försstel (1972) 120 Lobel: κα[ί τὰ? 122 ᾄ τ' ἔσσει]ται or ὅσα τ' ἔσ]ται Lobel Μναμοσύνα . . . ἔφρασεν Lobel: Μναμοσύνα[ς κόραι] . . . ἔφρασεν or Μναμοσύνα[ν διὰ] . . . ἔφρασεν (sc. Pallas)? Sn 123 ΚΦ supp. Lobel 124 παλ[αῖον Sn; κάρχ]αῖον? perhaps δ' ὅλον Försstel (1972) ἀπνευστοῦσα? Sn; ἀπνεύ[στωσε? 125]Υ rather than]Χ,]Κ? ἔκ τῷ Sn 126]Γ,]Τ 128 ὕ 129]Γ,]Τ ΑC 130]Ρ,]C,]Τ -που Π⁴: -ΠΩ Π⁴; με]τῶπ-/προ]σῶπ- D'Alessio ἴνα οἱ or ἴν' ἀο[ιδ Sn 131 Ρ[better than I, Φ[133 Α[, Δ[, Λ[, Χ[

Σ 1 ff. (Π⁴ Σ^{δ1}) ἐγὼ χρυσ

2 ff. (Π⁴ Σ^{δ2}) μῆποθ' ὁ λόγος ἐκ τ[< 20] (Σ^ε) ὠκεανοῦ θέμιδος ἐπεί
 κα[< 20] (Σ^{δ2}) πάντας κατείρηκε τοὺς[< 20]

96 (Π⁴ fr. 107 Σ²¹) ἐποιήθη ὁ π[ρ]ώτος (sc. ναός) ἀπ[ὸ] δάφνης [ἐκομίσθη δὲ ἐκ τῶν Τεμπῶν |

143 ff. (Π⁴ fr. 82 col. 1 above the column Σ²¹) [τῷ δὲ Ἐργίνῳ ὁ θεὸς ἔχρ]ησεν μαντευομένῳ·

Ἐργίνε Κλυμένοιο πάϊ Πρεσβωνιάδαο,

ἐξήλθες γε, νεὴν διζήμενος, ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν

ἰστοβοῇ γέροντι νέην ποτίβαλλε κορώνην.

ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος λέγει ὅτι ἔχρησε ταῦτα α]ὐτῷ ὁ θεός, ἥνικ[α] π[α]ῖδας αὐτῷ γενέσθαι ἐπεθύμησεν [~?]] ἐλκόμενον· τὸν ποτε ἔλκυσάμενον

144 (Π⁴ in margin, written in shorter lines, Σ²¹) δασμόν ἀπήτει ἀναιρε- | [θέν-
τος τοῦ] πατρὸς Κλυ- | [μένου] . . . καὶ ὁ χρῆ- | [σμός προὔτρ]εψε στρατεύ- | [έσθαι ἐπὶ Θή]βας

143 ff. (Π²⁶ fr. 29. 1-8) ~?] . [.] ἐκπεσόντος χρησμοῦ Ἐργίνῳ στρατευο-
μ(έν)ῳ ἐπὶ Θήβας ἐτέρου[· | ~? λέγει] γ(άρ) ἀλλ' οὕτως τῷ Ἐργίνῳ ἐπεμψας
χρησμούς τῷ ἐπὶ τὰς Θήβας[| ἐλκ]υσσάμενόν τὸ ξίφος, ἀν(τι) στρατεύσαντι
τὸ γ(άρ) ἐλκόμ(εν)ον ἀν(τι) ἐλκ[υ]σάμ(εν)ον [εἴρη]ται. ~? Κλύμ(εν)ον ἀναι-
ρεθῆ(ναι) [Εὐφορί]ων μ(έν) ὑπὸ Περιήρους, Ἑλλάνι(κος) δ[έ | ὕ]πό
τινος Καδ[μείων] (?) κ[α]([ατ]) Ὀ[ρχηστ]όν (?) μαχόμ(εν)ον, Ἐπιμενίδ[η]ς[| δ'
ἐν ᾧ Γε[νεαλογ]ίων ὑπὸ Γλαύκου ἐρίσαντα τῷ ζεύγει τ. [~? δύο δὲ πόλ]εμοι
ἐγένοντο), ὁ μ(έν) Κλυμένου ἀναιρεθέντο(ς), | ὁ δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ] δασμό(ν) π[ι]([αρ])όν-
τας Ἡρακλέ(ος) ἀκρωτηριά[σαντος

Π⁴ suppl. GH, Robert (1914), Sn, Π²⁶ suppl. Lobel, Mette 1 ff. Χρῦσ(ιππος)?
GH 2 ff. ἐκ τ[οῦ] χοροῦ, τ[οῦ] ποιητοῦ D'Alessio (1991) τοὺς[νεώς D'Alessio
(1991) 96 suppl. Sn 143 ff. [Εὐφορί]ων Fowler (1993)

TRIAD A. MARGINAL TITLE: *For the . . . to Delphi*. Famous seers of Apollo, I over land and over the Ocean and to the (realms?) of Themis . . . (laurel) . . .

TRIAD C (?) . . . winged . . . temple. The former the strong wind brought to the Hyperboreans. But what was the pattern, O Muses, that the latter showed, through the artful strength of Hephaestus and Athene? Bronze were the walls, bronze pillars stood beneath, and six golden Charmers sang above the gable. But the sons of Cronus opened the ground with a thunderbolt and hid it, the most sacred of all works . . .

TRIAD D (?) . . . astonished at the sweet voice, that foreigners wasted away apart from children and wives, hanging up their spirit as a dedication to the sweet voice . . . man-redeeming artefact of pure (words?) in the maiden's . . . and Pallas [Athene] put in . . . to the voice . . . and (the daughters of?) Memory told them everything that is, and that was before (and that will be?) . . . (making) breathless (ancient) guile . . . for the labour was upon (them) . . . virtue . . . pure . . . sharpest . . . (140) (Erginus) drawing his sword against Thebes . . .

(1 ff., Π⁴) 'I': Chrysippus [*i.e.* a reference to C.'s commentary?]. (2 ff., Π⁴) Perhaps the speech from . . . (Σ²) Of Okeanos of Themis since . . . he recounted all the . . . (96, Π⁴) The first (temple) was made from laurel, and was brought from Tempe.

(143 ff., Π⁴) When Erginus consulted the oracle the god answered, 'Erginus, child of Clymenus son of Presbon, you have come seeking offspring. But even now put a new tip on the old plough.' Pindar says that the god gave him this answer when he desired to have children born to him (?); 'drawing': 'the one who once drew'. (144, Π⁴) He demanded tribute when his father Clymenus was killed, and the oracle encouraged him to campaign against Thebes. (143 ff., Π²⁶) Another oracle being given to Erginus as he was campaigning against Thebes. For he says, 'But in this way you sent the oracle to Erginus who had drawn his sword against Thebes', instead of 'who had campaigned'; 'drawing' is used instead of 'having drawn' . . . Euphorion (?) (says) that Clymenus had been killed by Perieres, Hellanicus that he was killed by one of the Cadmeians while fighting around Onchestus . . . Epimenides, however, in bk. 13 of the *Genealogies* [cf. *FGrH* 457] says he was killed by Glaucus as he was competing with the chariot . . . there were two wars, one when Clymenus was killed, the other when Heracles mutilated those who came to fetch the tribute.

The narrative section of this song is concerned with the four mythological temples at Delphi. No other poem in praise of a temple is known from classical Greece, but they are found in the Near East. For example, from Sumerian civilization comes a collection of hymns to different temples, compiled by the priestess Enhedu-anna in the Neo-Sumerian period (2200–2000 BC). It seems likely that before these were collected, the texts were located inside or on the walls of the temples themselves. So too it is easy to imagine that Pindar's composition was stored in the historical Delphic temple as a permanent panegyric of it, and a source of edification for visitors.¹

Two sections of the song are reconstructed: a later section comprises the last two triads, containing a section of Pindar's articulation of the great myth of the four temples at Delphi, while a short earlier section contains the first four lines, with a fragment of the title. What is the relation between the opening and the large stretch of the final two triads? Snell believed that he could determine this by calculating where inter- and intra-triadic breaks would occur in the columns of Π⁴.² He reasoned from the following premisses. (1) The strophe of B2 has 12 lines and the epode 13 lines, making a total of 37 for the triad. (2) The line *κλυτοὶ μάντιες Ἀπόλλωνος* was the first line in an antistrophe, therefore line 13 in its triad, and since this line was the third line from the bottom of a column, the next column must have started with line 4 of the antistrophe or line 16 of the triad. (3) The number of lines per column is generally 15. (4) The right edge of the column of Π⁴ that contained the end of the song survives (fr. 82 col. 1), and to judge from the scholia,

¹ The text of the Sumerian collection is edited by Sjöberg, Bergmann, and Gragg (1969); Sumerian rulers who built or restored temples also left hymns describing their accomplishments: see Klein (1989).

² Snell (1962).

that column contained both the end of B2 and the start of the next song, B3. One line—which could be either the sixth or the seventh in the column—seems to have jugged out beyond the others, and since the last line of the epode of the penultimate column is longer than the other lines of the epode, Snell came to the conclusion that this probably represented the last line of B2. (5) A few other parts of the song are preserved from Π^4 , among them fr. 90 (B2. 103-7 = y 28-33) (I refer to the final triad as z , the penultimate as y , the antepenultimate as x , and so on) and fr. 87 (B2. 109-12 = y 35- z 1). Any reconstruction must take account of these premisses. On the basis of this Snell figured out that a suitable correlation of column and triad would occur in the antepenultimate triad (x).³

Although we now know that Snell's reconstruction was misguided, it might still be possible to adapt his method to the revised data. What we would be looking for is a triad which began 3 lines from the bottom of a column (that is, the fourth line of a triad would have been at the top of a column). If one assumes a 15-line column, one could produce a suitable reconstruction with 3 or 5 triads, though one would have to assume that only two or three lines occurred at the top of the final column, which is perfectly reasonable (the unusually long line in the sixth or seventh line of the first column of fr. 82 would then have to belong to B3).⁴

However, this sort of reconstruction comes up against an obstacle: Snell assumed a regular 15-line column throughout Π^4 , but while it is true that most of the surviving columns have 15 lines, most come from section A of the papyrus, whereas in sections D and C the proportion of 16-line columns seems to have been much higher, and the single column preserved from section B has 17 lines.⁵ If we allow for the possibility of 16- and 17-line columns, it becomes very difficult to pin down the length of the poem. However, if we work on the assumption that most of the columns in this section of

³ Assuming that each column had 15 lines, Snell postulated that the initial lines in the columns were (working back from the end): z 32; z 17; z 2; y 24; y 9; x 31; x 16; x 1.

⁴ For three triads, the initial lines of columns (again working back from the end) would be: z 35; z 20; z 5; y 27; y 12; x 34; x 19; x 4. For five triads they would be: z 36; z 21; z 6; y 28; y 13; x 35; x 20; x 5; w 27; w 12; v 34; v 19; v 4. A five-triad B2 would be 185 lines long, which would be comparable to two other Delphic *παίâves*, the length of which we know: Pind. D6 (183 lines) and Philod. *παίâv* (165 lines).

⁵ See pp. 139, 141.

the papyrus had 16 lines, the likeliest number of triads would seem to be four, which is what I have assumed here.⁶

The song began with an address to the Delphic seers; the words *κλυτοὶ μάντι[ες]* recall the opening of D6.⁷ These were probably mythological seers associated with Delphi, such as Tenerus and Branchus.⁸ In that case, this address might be equivalent to an invocation to the Muses, appealing to the seers for divine wisdom.

In the following line the speaker talks of doing something 'over earth and Okeanos'; if this expression specifies where he comes from, or where he travels, then he would have to be a god, or a shaman; but it is more likely that he is the poet, or a member of the *χορός* (Σ 2 ff. [init.] might have elucidated), and that he is saying that he will send the fame of the Delphic priests and their temples beyond land and sea.⁹

The initial section perhaps broke off in line 4 with a reference to Themis, restored from a scholion. In a fragment of the *Hymn to Zeus* (fr. 30) the Moirai are said to have transported Themis on a golden throne to Olympus *Ὀκεανοῦ παρὰ παγᾶν* ('from the fountains of Okeanos'), so perhaps Okeanos was further specified here as the original abode of Themis. On the other hand, there was a close association between *θέμις*/Themis and Delphi, which resonates both on the level of myth (Themis was supposed once to have owned the oracle, and hence the tripod was regarded as her property) and on the level of symbol (*θέμις*/Themis stands for the idea of divine justice emanating from the oracle, and also for the oracular rulings, *θέμιστες*, that are its medium). So it seems more likely that this line specified the destination of the speaker: over earth and Okeanos, to (Delphi), the realm of Themis.¹⁰

⁶ Length indeterminate: Rutherford (1991a); four triads: D'Alessio (1991), 111; fuller discussion: Bagnall, Frier, and Rutherford (1997), 13–18.

⁷ The epithet *κλυτομάντιες* occurs again at A2. 22. I would compare *παιᾶνα κλυτόμητιν* at the start of the Erythraean *παιᾶν* to Asclepius (see p. 39).

⁸ *πάντας* in Σ 2 ff. could refer to Apolline seers, unless it refers to the sequence of temples.

⁹ Pindar often mentions sea and land when describing the dissemination of glory: e.g. *Nem.* 6. 48; *Isth.* 4. 41 ff.; *Isth.* 6. 22 ff.; also *Bacch.* 13. 180 ff.; 9. 40–1. I am indebted to the discussion of Förstel (1972), 101–2. A similar opening is found in Mesomedes, 3 (*εἰς Ἴσω εἰς ὕμνος ἀνά τε γᾶν | ἀνά τε νηὺς ἀλιπόρους | ᾄδεται* ('One song is sung through the land and through sea-faring ships')).

¹⁰ Themis as owner of the oracle: Aesch. *Eum.* 3; Eur. *IT* 1259 ff.; Vos (1956), 62–3; Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), 239 (=1991), 241 n. 52. Themis' tripod: Eur.

The larger surviving section of the song was the myth of the four Delphic temples, best known from Pausanias (10. 5. 12), who draws on Pindar (the absence of any other early source is perhaps a reason for thinking that Pindar had a large hand in creating the myth). The Alcmaeonid temple at Delphi known to Pindar was supposed to have been the fifth temple on that site. The first was a laurel temple built by Apollo. Why this did not last is not made clear—perhaps it burnt down. The second, the temple of feathers (πτερινός), was built by bees out of beeswax and birds' feathers, but it was no more durable; it was spirited away by a strong wind to the Hyperboreans, taking flight like the birds and bees which had helped to create it. The third temple was built by Hephaestus and Athena, and was composed of precious metals, equipped with a number of singing creatures called *Κηληδόνες* who entranced men; for this reason the gods eventually hid it beneath the earth. The fourth was built out of stone by Trophonius and Agamedes, the sons of Erginus, and this was supposed to have lasted until the middle of the sixth century BC, when it was burnt to the ground.¹¹

Myths concerning the origin of a temple are rare in the Greek world. From Hellenistic Egypt we have an elegiac poem by Isidorus inscribed on the temple of Isis at Medinet Madi in the Fayyum in praise of the semi-mythical figure Porramanres (= Amenemhet III), who was supposed to have built the temple. Another close parallel is Lucian's account of the origin of the temple of the Syrian goddess (Atargatis-Derketo) at Hierapolis-Bambyke, which, however, involves mainly human characters rather than supernatural activity. In that respect it is like the biblical account of Solomon's building of the Temple at Jerusalem.¹²

However, temples of supernatural origin figure in the mythologies of both Mesopotamia and Egypt. In the Babylonian Creation Epic *Enuma Elis* (tablet VI) the gods rewarded Marduk for killing Tiamat by building a temple in his honour at Babylon; like other

Or. 163–5; cup Berlin 2538 by the Kodros painter (about 440 BC: *ARV*² 1269. 5; *Add*³ 356; *LIMC* i/2, pl. 274 = Aigeus). *θέμις* and Delphi: Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 9–10; *Nem.* 7. 47 (*θεμισκόπος* of Neoptolemus) (pp. 314–15). *θέμις* as 'oracular ruling': H3. 1 (p. 397). Themis and the fountains of Okeanos: Förstel (1972), 102.

¹¹ Two sources give a shorter list, Arist. fr. 3 Rose and Strabo 9. 3. 9, both of which I provide in the appendix of sources on pp. 231–2. The same myth may also have been mentioned in Call. fr. 118 (from the *Aetia*; cf. Pfeiffer ad loc.).

¹² Isidorus, *Hymn* 4: Totti (1985), 81–2; Vanderlip (1972), 67, provides commentary. Syrian goddess: Luc. *De dea Syria*, 12–16, 19–27. Solomon's temple: 1 Kgs. 6.

Mesopotamian temples, it had a name, *E-sag-ila*, 'The temple with head aloft'. This Babylonian myth finds a reflex in the Ugaritic tradition that tells how the craftsman deity Kothar-wa-Hasis built a palace for Baal after a similar victory.¹³ And sacred texts found on the walls of the temple of Horus at Edfu in Upper Egypt tell of the creation there, presumably by supernatural forces, of two temples, one in honour of the falcon (Horus) and the other in honour of the sun (Re), soon after the first appearance of land at Edfu, when the primeval waters first parted to make a clearing.¹⁴ The temple of Horus was built round a perch, where the falcon first came to rest (the idea of a perched bird seems to resonate in the architecture of the Delphic temples). These texts show no awareness of a sequence of mythological temples; on the contrary, it seems that the contemporary (Ptolemaic) temple at Edfu is imagined as being in some sense identical to the primeval one. Despite this difference, the Edfu texts are a sign that there may have been a widespread tradition of temple myths behind the Delphic myth of the four temples.

The surviving part of Pindar's song opens with what looks like a transition from the second to the third temple: the second is transported to the Hyperboreans (it returns north in the direction from which the laurel for the first had come).¹⁵ The word *πετ[ην- or πετ[ειν-* (neither elsewhere in Pindar) could be an adjective 'winged' describing the creatures (birds and bees) that built the temple.¹⁶

We would expect the first temple to have been mentioned earlier on. A fragment of scholia from Π⁴ referring to the laurel temple probably comes from earlier in the song, though I am not convinced that a form of *δάφν[α* has to be restored in lines 95–6.¹⁷

The main description of the third temple probably began with a question addressed to the Muses (line 102): what was the shape (*ῥυθμός*) of the temple built by Hephaestus and Athena? The word

¹³ The Babylonian myth is translated by Dalley (1989), 262. For the Ugaritic myth see below, p. 227.

¹⁴ Reymond (1969); Finnestad (1985).

¹⁵ The detail that it is the wind that transports the temple is not found in Pausanias, who attributes the transportation to Apollo. Cf. ps.-Eratosthen. *Catast.* 29 (*MG* iii/1. 35. 10 ff.). Pindar does not involve Apollo here or anywhere else in the story: see Förstel (1972), 125 ff., on his absence.

¹⁶ An alternative suggestion was made by Snell, who thought that *πετ[εινόν* might go with *ναόν* in line 100, arguing that if the 'feathered' temple reflects the architectural term *περίπτερος* ('with a single row of columns around it'), then the temple could by the same token be described as 'winged' (see p. 226).

¹⁷ Fr. 107; transcribed in Σ 96.

ῥυθμός (only here in Pindar), which properly denotes a flowing motion, here perhaps suggests the regular shape of the temple, particularly the pattern made by the different metals (105–7).¹⁸ The association of Hephaestus and Athena reminds us perhaps of Hesiod's account of the creation of Pandora.¹⁹

The centre-piece of the third temple is the *Κηληδόνες* ('Charmers').²⁰ These are said to be located above the αἵετός (line 107), which is a common Greek architectural term for the gable (also called ἀέτωμα), perhaps less likely to be derived from the resemblance that a triangular gable bears to an eagle's spreading wings than from the Near Eastern and Egyptian custom of decorating gables with winged solar discs.²¹ The *Κηληδόνες* themselves reflect the ἀκρωτήρια of real Greek temples, of which there were usually six (positioned at the top and sides of each gable); even the detail that they were golden fits here, because the temple of Zeus at Olympia had golden ἀκρωτήρια.²² A real-life work of art that may have contributed to the idea of the Delphic *Κηληδόνες* is the famous winged Sphinx, dedicated by the Naxians in the period 570–560 BC, which sat perched on top of a tall column immediately to the south of the historical temple.²³

¹⁸ DELG s.v.; Sandoz (1971). For the architectural sense Sandoz compares Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 78 (*Thalamopoioi*) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν τις Λέσβιον φατνώματι κύμ' ἐν τριγώνοις ἐκπεραινέτω ῥυθμοῖς ('Let someone produce on the ceiling a Lesbian moulding with a triangular pattern').

¹⁹ Hes. *The.* 571–4, *Op.* 70–2, where there is a division of labour: Hephaestus makes her and Athena clothes her. Comparable is the simile in Hom. *Od.* 6. 232–4 = 23. 159–61 ὡς δ' ὅτε τις χρυσὸν περιχέυεται ἀργύρῳ ἀνὴρ | ἔδρις, ὃν Ἥφαιστος δέδαεν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη | τέχνην παντοίην, χαρίεντα δὲ ἔργα τελεΐει ('As when someone pours gold around silver, a skilled man, whom Hephaestus and Pallas Athena have taught all kinds of art, and he produces pleasant works'). On the association between Athena and Hephaestus see Förstel (1972), 116 n. 84. τέχνην παντοίην here reminds us of παντέχν[οις] in B2. 102.

²⁰ Philostr., *VA* 6. 11, cited in the source appendix below, calls them ὕγγες (cf. *VA* 1. 25 *re* the palace of the king of Persia), which suggested the supplement ὕλγγες ('wrynecks') in line 99?, but cf. now Dickie (1997).

²¹ Sahin (1981); Perring (1933). Pindar refers to the αἵετός also at *Ol.* 13. 20–2; the *locus classicus* for the term is Galen's discussion of Hipp. *De art.* 43 (xviii/1. 518–19K). It was a technical term by the late 6th cent. BC, as we see from *IG* i/3. 474. 187 (*Erechtheum* accounts). See Lapalus (1947), 66–70; A. Mau, *RE* s.v. *Aetoma* i. 705.

²² Position on ἀκρωτήρια: Furtwängler (1882), 343; Drerup (1986), 208, Förstel (1972), 130–1 n. 136. Bowra (1964), 373–4, disagrees, suggesting that they might have been above the pediment. The golden ἀκρωτήρια: Paus. 5. 10. 4 (λέβητες at the ends and a Νίκη in the middle). The golden lion that Croesus made for Delphi (Her. 1. 50. 2 ff.) may also have been an ἀκρωτήριον. ²³ *GD* (site) 144 ff.

From this position above the gable the *Κηληδόνες* sang. Their song was intoxicating, so much so that strangers flocked to Delphi and lingered there, wasting away²⁴ and hanging up their souls as an offering to the voice, in a metaphor that suggests both a religious dedication and psychological dependency.²⁵ What sort of song was it? In the context of Delphi, one naturally thinks of a *παιάν*—not the original *παιάν*, perhaps, because the Pythoconia had already taken place by this point, but an archetypical *παιάν* nevertheless. The destructive effect of the song would certainly suit the ambiguous profile that I established earlier for the *παιάν*. Another possibility, suggested by the obvious analogy between the *Κηληδόνες* and the Sirens of Homer's *Odyssey*, is that the song might have been a narration of universal knowledge like the song of the Sirens (*Od.* 12. 189–91):

ἴδμεν γάρ τοι πάνθ' ὅσ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ
 Ἀργεῖοι Τρώες τε θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησαν,
 ἴδμεν δ' ὅσσα γένηται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πολυβοτείρῃ.

(We know all the labours that the Argives and Trojans underwent in wide Troy through the will of the gods, and we know all that happens on the earth that feeds many.)

If their song was of this sort, the *Κηληδόνες* would be precursors of the Delphic oracle. Some such association may be reflected in the Pythagorean tradition that the oracle at Delphi is 'the τετρακτύς (i.e. 1 + 2 + 3 + 4), the harmony in which the Sirens sing'.²⁶

The disastrous effects of the song of the *Κηληδόνες* prompt a savage divine response. The 'sons of Kronos' (probably Zeus and Poseidon) opened the earth with a thunderbolt and hid the temple.²⁷ The suffering of ξένοι will have particularly offended the *Κρόνου παῖδες*, of whom Zeus Xeinius, patron of visitors, was one.²⁸ What follows—in the narrative and in the text—is not clear; lines 116–25

²⁴ Pilgrims are often represented as coming to grief in Greek myth: see Rutherford (1995e).

²⁵ For the metaphor of 'hanging' as an expression of psychological dependency see also Pind. *Isth.* 2. 43; Plato, *Ion*, 536 A.

²⁶ Segal (1983), 40; τετρακτύς: lambl. *Vita Pyth.* 85; see Delatte (1915), 260 ff.; Burkert (1972), 187.

²⁷ Paus. 10. 5. 12 says that there were two versions of how the temple disappeared: it may have fallen into a χάσμα γῆς or it may have been destroyed by fire. Pindar's account is clearly the first. Contrast Lobel (1961), 46: 'Pindar's account . . . covers both versions'.

²⁸ For this aspect of Zeus in Pindar see *Ol.* 8. 21; *Nem.* 5. 73; *Nem.* 11. 8; Lloyd-Jones (1971), 5 ff.

contain some of the most difficult problems in the *Paianes*. The words *λυσίμβροτον* and *δαίδαλμα* should probably be taken together in the sense of 'a man-redeeming artefact'.²⁹ This might refer to the *Κηληδόνες* or their song or the temple.³⁰ *παρθενία* in line 117 perhaps refers to the *Κηληδόνες* or their voice;³¹ *ἀκηράτων*, which might mean either 'pure' or 'unscathed', could well refer to the *Κηληδόνες* also.³² The subject of the sentence that starts at line 119 is Athena (one thinks of Athena Pronaia, who had a cult at Delphi),³³ and she is said to have inserted something into something. What she inserted is perhaps universal (prophetic or poetic) knowledge (lines 120–1), and what she inserted it into was perhaps a voice.³⁴ This idea is continued a few lines later with the statement that someone—presumably either Athena or Mnemosyne—'told them (*σφιν*) everything'. In line 124 (the first line of the antistrophe) Snell suggested the attractive *παλ[αῖ]δὸν δόλον*, governed by a

²⁹ *λυσίμβροτον* occurs only here. Förstel (1972), 106–7, argues that it means 'destroying mortals', like the Homeric *φθισίμβροτος* (*Il.* 13. 339; *Od.* 22. 297), with *λυσι-* as in *λυσιμελής* and Homeric *λύειν γυῖα, γούνατα, μένος*. But it can also mean 'delivering mortals', as in personal names like *Λυσίδαμος, Λυσίλεως, Λυσιόπολις, Λυσίστρατος*, even a *Λυσιμβρότη* (see Fick (1894), 193 ff.; Bechtel (1917), 291 ff.).

³⁰ The root *δαιδαλ-* is applied to poetry at Pind. *Ol.* 1. 29; *Ol.* 1. 105; *Nem.* 11. 18; *Parth.* 2 (fr. 94b) 31; also at Himer. *Or.* 68. 3; more usually *δαίδαλμα* is used of art-works, e.g. Theocr. *Id.* 1. 32; Luc. *Am.* 13; Nonn. 37. 127; Agathias, 2. 15 (*HGM* ii. 204), the last in the context of buildings. The semantics of the word are examined by Morris (1992), who mentions this song on p. 46.

³¹ Pindar describes the Sphinx as a *παρθένος* in fr. 177d; alternatively, the reference could be to Athena, or to the Muses, whom Pindar calls *παρθέναι* at *Isth.* 8. 57; D6. 54. In that case lines 79–81 might be another, rather involved, invocation of the Muses. But that is difficult to square with lines 119 ff., where Athena seems to be bestowing the power of prophecy on whatever is the subject of the previous lines.

³² Förstel (1972), 101, rejects the meaning 'unscathed' on the ground that the *Κηληδόνες* are destroyed; but they might be intact under the ground. However, the idea of pure virgin singers is perhaps more attractive: *ἀκηράτος* is used of a virgin at Eur. *Tro.* 675; Plato, *Lates*, 840 D; linked to virgins at Ibycus, *PMG* 286. 4; *PMG* 851b 4–5 (*Carm. pop.*).

³³ Athena's cult title at Delphi was *Προναία* (Aesch. *Eum.* 21; Her. 1. 92; 8. 37–9; H. v. Geisau, *RE* s.v. *Pronaia* xlv. 736 ff.). Her shrine was to the east of the main precinct in the so-called Marmaria (Paus. 10. 8. 6). According to Aristonoos, *παῖν*, 19 ff., Apollo set up the cult because Athena brought him to Pytho. Athena's interest in prophecy at B2. 119 ff. is a surprise. Snell (1962), 5, suggested that Pindar interpreted the epithet *Προναία* as *Πρόνοια*; see also p. 366 on G1. 11.

³⁴ Theoretically, *φωνῇ* could also be the 3rd-person singular present of *φωναίω*, though Forssman (1966), 81, claims that present forms of the verb were avoided by Pindar because it was athematic in Lesbian; see also Nöthiger (1971), 80 n. 1.

form of an otherwise unattested verb ἀπνευστόω.³⁵ Line 125 seems to refer to some sort of task.³⁶

These difficult lines could have several possible references. Most interpreters have assumed that they continue the chronological sequence in some way. Several variations of this hypothesis are possible:

1. The lines may refer to the *Κηληδόνες* and the temple, and something that Athena did to them after the gods had buried them; for example, she might have equipped them with the power of prophecy, 'making breathless their former deceit'. This is how the lines are taken by Snell.

2. The lines might refer to something different from the *Κηληδόνες*, e.g. the next temple and/or the Pythian priestesses that succeeded them. In that case the δόλος would refer to the prophetic song of the *Κηληδόνες* as a whole, which was essentially deceitful.

3. The beginning of the passage might refer to the survival of the temple and the *Κηληδόνες*, but the closing part (σφιν and πόνος) to the Pythian priestesses. This is roughly how the passage is taken by Förstel.³⁷

However, it is not absolutely inevitable that the passage follows chronological sequence. Perhaps the lines constitute a flash-back and refer to the construction of the *Κηληδόνες* and the third temple.³⁸ A point in favour of this is the partial omniscience (past and present, not future) attributed to the Sirens in *Odyssey* 12 (cited above). The 'deceit' that Athena 'made breathless' in line 124 (if Snell's supplement is right) would refer to an earlier stage before the creation of the *Κηληδόνες*, and the πόνος of line 125 could perhaps refer to their divinely appointed task.

The fourth temple (perhaps lines 137–48) was built out of stone by the brothers Trophonius and Agamedes. (The idea that the architects were two brothers has an interesting parallel in Egypt:

³⁵ It would stand in the same relation to ἀπνευστος (first in Hom. *Od.* 5. 456) as αἰστος to αἰστώ (*Pyth.* 3. 37; D6. 97).

³⁶ For ἐπὶ πόνος compare *Anacreontea*, 60. 3 West (1984) μελέτη δ' ἐπεσι ('care is incumbent'); also ἀθάνατ[ο]ν πόνον in C2. 22, with references cited there.

³⁷ Förstel (1972), 120; he calls them a *Zwischeninstanz* between gods and men (121).

³⁸ Prof. Charles Segal alerted me to this possibility; I find it also in Carey (1992), 15. Sirens and *Κηληδόνες* are parallel at *Vita Sophoclea*, 64 φασὶ δὲ ὅτι καὶ τῷ μνήματι αὐτοῦ σειρήνα ἐπέστησαν, οἱ δὲ *Κηληδόνα* χαλκῆν ('Some say that they placed a siren on his tomb, others that they placed a bronze *Κηληδών*').

the temple of Amun-Ra at Luxor, which dates from about 1400 BC, was designed by the twin brothers Suti and Her.³⁹) The fourth temple was burnt down during the archonship of Erxichides at Athens (548 BC). This corresponds to the temple described in lines 296–9 of the *Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo*. The background is given by Pausanias: Clymenus, king of the Minyae, was killed by a Theban, but not before he had ordered his son, Erginus, to avenge his death. Erginus attacked Thebes and imposed a twenty-year tribute. Heracles counterattacked, but spared the life of Erginus. Later on, in old age, the wifeless and childless Erginus desired children and went to Delphi. The Pythia told him: 'Put a new tip on the old plough'.⁴⁰ So he took a young wife and sired Trophonius and Agamedes, who grew up to be famous architects and built the temple at Delphi.⁴¹

We gather from scholia surviving in two papyri that this myth was mentioned in the concluding lines of the song. It is possible that the second triad had been mainly concerned with the Delphic oracle and that a transition was made to Erginus' consultation of the oracle as an example of its efficacy. The scholia preserve a lemma: ἐπὶ Θήβας | ξίφος ἐλκόμενον ('drawing his sword against Thebes'), which refers to what Erginus was doing when Apollo sent him the oracle, presumably the oracle about having a child. This seems to have troubled the commentators, because in other versions of the saga Erginus consulted the oracle only after the war finished. We see them suggesting that the present participle should be interpreted as an aorist participle with a past reference, and that there were two oracles. Pindar may have been following a different version in which the consultation happened before the war (perhaps a version in which Apollo recommended that Erginus marry a Theban bride).

We know from Plutarch that Pindar told the story that when Trophonius and Agamedes asked Apollo for payment for building the temple, he told them (presumably by oracle) that he would pay them on the seventh day, and that in the meantime they should feast; they carried out his orders, but on the seventh night they fell asleep and died.⁴² This is usually connected with Pindar fr. 2,

³⁹ Suti and Her are discussed by Breasted (1912), 315; Wallis Budge (1934), 414 ff.

⁴⁰ Parke and Wormell (1956), no. 111; Fontenrose (1978), L9. It is cited in Σ to line 106.

⁴¹ Paus. 10. 5. 13; the earlier part of the story, without the continuation about children, is told by Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 4. 11. See Heidenreich (1954–5).

⁴² Plut. *Consol. Apoll.* 109 A=Pind. fr. 3. According to another tradition, Tropho-

known to come from the Isthmian *Epinikion* in honour of Kasmulos of Rhodes, which refers to Apollo's advice to Trophonius and Agamedes. But it is also possible that an allusion to Apollo's deadly reward provided a sombre conclusion to Pindar's *Paian* on the Delphic temples.⁴³

Considering the myth as a whole, we see that Pindar aimed to include all spheres of nature in the construction of the temple. It is reminiscent of the five-stage myth of the races in Hesiod's *Works and Days*; note in particular the conspicuous anaphora on words for metal:⁴⁴

τῶν δ' ἦν χάλκεα μὲν τεύχεα, χάλκεοι δέ τε οἶκοι,
χαλκῶ δ' εἰργάζοντο.

(Bronze were their weapons, bronze their houses, and they worked with bronze.)

There is a specially close parallel to the myth of the four temples here in the idea of a succession of stages moving from precious metal through non-precious metal to non-metallic, and from semi-divine to non-divine. But Pindar goes beyond it in including the plant and animal world. Another model, suggested by Sourvinou-Inwood, may have been the description of the building of the temple in lines 294–9 of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.⁴⁵

ὥς εἰπὼν διέθηκε θεμελίω Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
295 εὐρέα καὶ μάλα μακρὰ διηκεές· αὐτὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς
λαῖνον οὐδὸν ἔθηκεν Τροφώνιος ἦδ' Ἀγαμήδης
νιέες Ἐργίνου, φίλοι ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν·
ἀμφὶ δὲ νηὸν ἔνασσαν ἀθέσφατα φύλ' ἀνθρώπων
κτιστοῖσιν λάεσσιν, αἰοίδιμον ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ.

299 κτιστοῖσι MSS: ξεστοῖσι Ernesti

(So saying Phoebus Apollo laid out the foundations, broad and very long; and on them a stone socle was laid by Trophonius and Agamedes, the sons of Erginus, loved by the immortal gods, and around it innumerable tribes of men built a temple, with stones fixed in the ground, to be sung for ever.)

nus became a prophet at Lebadeia, having been swallowed by the earth when he killed his brother Agamedes: see Schachter (1981–5), also Clark (1968). A connection between Trophonius and Delphi is implied in Euripides' *Ion*, in which Xouthos consults the oracle of Trophonius as a preliminary to the Delphic oracle.

⁴³ The source for Pind. fr. 2 is *SLuc. Dial. mort.* 10, 255. 24 Rabe; the name of Trophonius appears there in the form *Τρεφόνιος*.

⁴⁴ *Op.* 150–1. For the anaphora see Fehling (1969), 204, comparing *Ol.* 2. 61; fr. 1 (*Isth.* 9. 1).

⁴⁵ Sourvinou-Inwood (1979), 249 ff. (=1991, 206 ff.).

After Apollo had laid the foundations, Trophonius and Agamedes added the *λάϊνον οὐδόν*, which perhaps means the *adyton*.⁴⁶ Then, if the text and sequence of lines is correct, men built round it with stones described as *κτιστοί*, which could mean 'assembled' or 'worked'.⁴⁷ So there are divine, heroic, and mortal phases in the construction of the temple. Pindar's version has a wider range of builders (birds and bees as well as gods and heroes), and a wider range of materials (animal, vegetable, and precious metal as well as stone). The result is a richer and more interesting myth.⁴⁸

The myth may have been Pindar's creation, but in creating it he would have been exploiting traditional ideas about divine architecture reflected in rituals, architecture, or other myths. Thus, the laurel temple probably reflects the role of laurel in the cult of Apollo, specifically in the Delphic Septerion, since Pausanias reports a tradition that the laurel-branches for the first temple came from Tempe. The hut that was burnt down in the earlier stages of the Septerion festival may have been made of laurel also.⁴⁹ The possibility that real laurel temples might once have existed was opened up in 1971 when Swiss archaeologists claimed to have located the foundations of a small laurel temple in Eretria, dating from the mid-eighth century BC; even if it was really no more than a votive offering, it could still be the inspiration for the laurel temple in the myth.⁵⁰

To move to the second temple, although there is no indication that temples, or even votive temples, were ever made out of wax or feathers, the general idea of a winged temple seems to

⁴⁶ The *οὐδός* was probably a stone foundation running the length of the cella; see von Blumenthal (1928). Steph. Byz., 224. 21 Meineke, says that at Delphi τὸ ἄδυτον ἐκ πέντε κατεσκευάσται λίθων, ἔργον Ἀγαμήδους καὶ Τροφωνίου ('the *ἄδυτον* is built from five stones, the work of Trophonius and Agamedes'); the specification of 'five' stones may be meant to explain the *E* at Delphi; there is no need to emend to *Πεντησίων*.

⁴⁷ The established order of lines can only be right if *ἔνασσαν* can mean 'built'; otherwise line 298 must be placed after 299 or deleted entirely; see von Blumenthal (1928); Wade-Gery (1936), 58 ff. Fraenkel (1968), 228–9, defends the transmitted order on the ground that the beginnings of the lines provide an aetiology for the name of the Amphictyones. On the sense of *κτιστοί* see Casevitz (1985), 27.

⁴⁸ Sourvinou-Inwood (1979), 250–1 (=1991), 208–10).

⁴⁹ See p. 201; Förstel (1972), 111; Sourvinou-Inwood (1979), 233–4 (=1991), 194–5).

⁵⁰ Bérard (1971); Auberson (1974); Auberson and Schefold (1972), 118–19 and 116 fig. 22; doubts are cast on it by Drerup (1986), n. 22. Auberson and Schefold (1972), 118, think it is a votive offering.

be implied in the architectural term *περίπτερος*, meaning 'with a single row of columns around it', which could well be pre-Pindaric; it might also have been suggested by the use of the term *αἰετός* for the gable, and the Near Eastern and Egyptian practice of putting sun-discs on gables, that lies behind this.⁵¹ The Near Eastern background is still broader: winged door-shaped objects, represented on cylinders from Akkad (around 2300 BC), have been interpreted as winged temples, the wings perhaps conveying the celestial nature of the temple; and among the Sumerians it seems to have been possible to use the idea of a bird as an image for a whole temple, since Gudea of Lagash described the temple *Eninnu* that he built for the god Ningirsu as a white *anzu* bird.⁵² Some of these ideas may have filtered through into the Greek world.

So much for the role of birds' feathers. As far as the wax is concerned, it is relevant that excavations at Delos revealed some blocks of stone, belonging to the external walls of two buildings, which were decorated on the outside with continuous hexagons forming a honeycomb pattern: the Letoon, built in about 540 BC, and the so-called 'Monument of the Hexagons', built between 530 and 500 BC. The idea of a temple built by bees perhaps reflects this form of decoration.⁵³

As for the third temple, I have already shown that *Κηληδόνες* and *αἰετός* had correlates in contemporary architecture. For the use of precious metal in the construction, Pausanias points out that Pindar had a sort of model in the temple of Athena Khalkioikos in Sparta, though in that case it was only the relief that was bronze.⁵⁴ Similarly, in Plato's account of the great temple of Poseidon in Atlantis (*Crit.* 116 D) the *ἀκρωτήρια* are plated in gold and the rest in silver. For a whole building constructed out of precious metal,

⁵¹ Snell (1938), 435; Förstel (1972), 132. The term *peripteros* is found at Vit. 3. 2. 1; for the *αἰετός* see p. 219.

⁵² Winged temples at Akkad: Amiet (1960). Gudea of Lagash: Gudea Statue D, 2. 7, in Steible (1991), 186-7.

⁵³ Letoon: Bruneau and Ducat (1983), 168 ff. Monument of Hexagons: Bruneau and Ducat (1983), 152 ff. Rumpf (1964) suggested that the pattern might have been inspired by the myth. See Sourvinou-Inwood (1979), 243-4 (=1991), 213 n. 44; Hellmann and Fraisse (1979), 73-4.

⁵⁴ Paus. 10. 5. 11; see Drerup (1952), 7 ff. Ar. *Clouds*, 599 (lyric), refers to the temple of Artemis at Ephesus as a *πάγχρυσον οἶκον* ('all-gold house'), which Köting (1950), 41 n. 215, takes as a reference to the cult statue.

we turn to the description of Alcinous' palace in Hom. *Od.* 7. 86 ff.:⁵⁵

χάλκεοι μὲν γὰρ τοῖχοι ἐλληέδατ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,
 ἐς μυχὸν ἐξ οὐδοῦ, περὶ δὲ θριγκὸς κυάνοιο·
 χρύσειαι δὲ θύραι πυκινὸν δόμον ἐντὸς ἔργον·
 σταθμοὶ δ' ἀργύρεοι ἐν χαλκῷ ἕστασαν οὐδῶ
 ἀργύρεον δ' ἐφ' ὑπερθύριον, χρυσέῃ δὲ κορώνῃ,
 χρύσειοι δ' ἐκάτερθε καὶ ἀργύρεοι κύνες ἦσαν
 οὓς Ἥφαιστος ἔτευξεν ἰδυίῃσι παπίδεσσι.

(Bronze walls ran from both sides, from the threshold to the inside. Around there was a coping of dark-blue enamel, and gold doors protected the close-packed house inside. Silver posts stood in the bronze threshold, the lintel above the door was silver, and the door-handle was golden. There were dogs of gold and silver on either side, which Hephaestus had made with his knowing heart.)

The parallel is close, except that this is not a temple. For temples made of precious metals we have to turn to Near Eastern sources. In one of the Sumerian temple hymns from the late third millennium BC collected by Enheduanna the temple of Inanna at Ulmas is described as being built out of silver, lapis lazuli, and gold, presumably a rhetorical exaggeration.⁵⁶ Similarly, an Ugaritic poem from the late second millennium BC, the so-called *Epic of Baal*, describes how the other gods rewarded Baal with the gift of a palace of precious metals (since this palace belonged to a god, it is not much different from a temple). This construction project is announced to Baal by 'Anat:⁵⁷

Receive the news, O Baal!
 Good news is brought to you:
 Let a house be given to you like your brothers,
 A court, like your kin.
 Call a caravan into your house,
 Wares amid your palace.
 Let the mountains bring you abundant silver,
 The hills, the choicest gold.
 And build the house with silver and gold,
 The house with purest lapis lazuli.

⁵⁵ The connection between the gardens of Alcinous and this passage is made by Drerup (1964), 207.

⁵⁶ Sjöberg, Bergmann, and Gragg (1969), 47, hymn 40. 512.

⁵⁷ S. B. Parker (1997), 130-1; cf. Gordon (1949); Caquot, Szyner, and Herdner (1974), 209.

The house is built by the craftsman deity Kothar-wa-Hasis, who therefore plays the same role as Athena and Hephaestus in Pindar's composition. Near Eastern parallels such as these, or similar ones, may well have been known to early Greek poets.

Any interpretation of the song must be highly tentative when so much is lost. We have no idea what came between the introduction and the myth of the four temples. One possibility would be an earlier stage of the aetiology of the cult of Apollo at Delphi, perhaps the story of how Apollo ousted Ge, the original female incumbent of Delphi, an episode which Pindar dealt with somewhere (see H2), or the myth of how the site of Delphi was determined by the meeting-point of two eagles (H1).

What survives suggests that it was the description of the third temple that constituted the main section of the narrative. One naturally assumes that the meaning of the narrative has to do with the contrast between the third temple and the institution of Delphic prophecy in the time of Pindar. The *Κηληδόνες* can plausibly be interpreted as a sort of back-projection of the Pythian priestesses in so far as they are female creatures who mediate between the world of the gods and the world of men.⁵⁸ If the suggestion that lines 120–1 refer to the creation of the *Κηληδόνες* is right, then their omniscience would be another factor linking them to the institution of Delphic prophecy.

It is unfortunate that we have lost the section of the song that described the transition from the third temple to the historical temple. Pindar could have handled this in various ways. Here are three possibilities. (1) The third temple is simply destroyed along with the *Κηληδόνες*, and the institution of Delphic prophecy replaces it. Presumably the institution of Delphic prophecy is better because there the contact between human and divine spheres is indirect and intermittent, so that it does not have the same deleterious effect on human society. (2) The temple is destroyed, but the *Κηληδόνες* are in some way transformed into the first priestesses.⁵⁹ (3) The temple and the *Κηληδόνες* are not destroyed, but simply hidden underground, where they continue to function as a source for prophetic knowledge. The most interesting hypothesis among

⁵⁸ Sourvinou-Inwood (1979), 245–6 (= (1991), 201–2).

⁵⁹ This seems to be the implication of Förstel's argument. That the Pythian priestesses were regarded as a late development is also suggested by their absence from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*; see Clay (1989), 75 ff.

these is (3). It may be significant that the gods hid the temple rather than destroying it, since there would be a similarity to the idea of Amphiaraus being swallowed up by the earth and becoming a seer after his death, a saga known to Pindar.⁶⁰ Hidden beneath the earth, the remains of the *Κηληδόνες* could have been imagined as exerting some sort of influence on the priestesses (there would be a striking parallel to the tradition attested only later, that the priestesses were inspired by vapours from a chasm).⁶¹

On any interpretation the development is a positive one: the third temple was a perfect creation but it had a deleterious effect on human society, and so had to be replaced with something less dangerous. We can contrast this with the myth of the fourth stasimon of Euripides, *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* (lines 1259 ff.), which interpreters have sometimes compared with B2. According to Euripides, when Apollo ejected Themis from her position at Delphi, Ge sent men dreams that contained information about the past and the future in order to break Apollo's monopoly on prophecy and thereby diminish the honours that accrued to him:

Θέμιν δ' ἐπεὶ γαῖων
παῖδ' ἀπενάσασατο < > ἀπὸ ζαθέων
χρηστηρίων, νύχια
Χθὼν ἐτεκνώσασα φάσματ' ὀνείρων),
οἳ πολέσιν μερόπων τά τε πρῶτα
τά τ' ἔπειθ', ὅσ' ἔμελλε τυχεῖν
ὑπνῷ κατὰ δνοφερὰς χαμεύ-
νας ἔφραζον· Γαῖα δὲ τὰν
μαντείων ἀφείλετο τι-
μὰν Φοῖβον φθόνῳ θυγατρὸς.

(When he caused Themis the child of the < ? > of earth to dwell away from the holy oracle, Earth gave birth to apparitions of dreams by night, which told many men in sleep in the course of their dark lyings the first events and later ones, which were destined to occur. Thus Earth took away the prestige of prophecy from Phoebus out of resentment for her daughter.)

There are several differences between this and the narrative in the *Paian*: Ge's prophecies do not precede Apollo's establishment of an oracle at Delphi, but they are a response to it; it is not even implied that Ge revealed her prophecies at Delphi. But most important,

⁶⁰ *Ol.* 6. 13; *Nem.* 9. 25. Similar myths are discussed by Pease (1942), 10 n. 79.

⁶¹ The Delphic chasm is mentioned by Strabo, 9. 3. 5; ps.-Long. *Sub.* 13. 2; Iamb. *De myst.* 3. 11; Diod. 16. 26. See also Oppé (1904), arguing that the tradition is based on a misunderstanding of the location of the gorge of Castalia.

Euripides does not say that Ge's prophecies posed any sort of threat to mankind. Consequently, when Zeus acceded to Apollo's request to suppress Ge's oracles and thereby deprive men of truth (line 1279), he was not acting to improve the human condition but simply to satisfy the whim of the young Apollo.⁶²

Pindar's narrative is an example of what might be called evolutionary cult aetiology. For an illustration of this we might turn once again to *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, this time to the general myth represented by the play, in which a savage mode of relationship between god and man—human sacrifice—is replaced by a mild form, the cult of Iphigeneia at Halai Araphenides in Attica, in which human sacrifice was not practised.⁶³ Another evolutionary cult aetiology which, since it involves female deities, is a good model for the one described in B2 is the evolution of the dangerous Erinyes into the safe Eumenides described in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. The Erinyes and the *Κηληδόνες* were both originally different types of creatures of the gods—the former dispensed the will of the gods by pursuing murderers whereas the *Κηληδόνες* broadcast divine music. The similarity is in their transformation: the Erinyes are not destroyed, but live on under the ground just as I have suggested that the *Κηληδόνες* may live on underneath the earth in Delphi.⁶⁴

It seems likely that the song was composed for, and performed on, some special occasion. What might the circumstances of performance have been? Snell inferred from the prominent position of Athena in B2 that the performers might have been Athenians.⁶⁵ If Maehler is right to read ΔΕΛ]ΦΟΙΣ in the title, it probably means that a Hellenistic editor believed that the performers, or at least the dedicatees, were Delphians. One clue about the circumstances of performance may be provided by the *παιάν* of Philodamus of Scarpheia which was dedicated at the Theoxenia in 340–339 BC, and contained an announcement that work on the sixth Delphic temple was to be resumed.⁶⁶ The Alcmaeonid (fifth) temple was

⁶² See Förstel (1972), 109; on this myth in general see Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), 229–30 (=1991), 231–2.

⁶³ Religious development within the play is discussed by Sansone (1975).

⁶⁴ Aesch. *Eum.* 804 ff. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑμῖν πανδίκως ὑπὶσχομαι | ἔδρας τε καὶ κευθμῶνας ἐνδίκου χθονός ('I promise you with all justice a seat and a hiding-place in the just earth').

⁶⁵ Snell (1962), 5; particularly Aristonoos, *παιάν*, 25 ff.

⁶⁶ See pp. 131–5.

perhaps completed about 505 BC,⁶⁷ so it seems unlikely that B2 could have been composed for its dedication. But if the song was commissioned at any time in the 490s or 480s, the choice of theme could still be partly explained as a celebration of the new temple.

APPENDIX

Sources for the Myth of the Four Delphic Temples

Paus. 10. 5. 9–12: ποιηθῆναι δὲ τὸν ναὸν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τὸ ἀρχαιότατον δάφνης φασί, κομισθῆναι δὲ τοὺς κλάδους ἀπὸ τῆς δάφνης τῆς ἐν τοῖς Τέμπεσι· καλύβης δ' ἂν σχῆμα οὗτός γε ἂν εἴη παρεσχηματισμένος ὁ ναός. δεύτερα δὲ λέγουσιν οἱ Δελφοὶ γενέσθαι ὑπὸ μελισσῶν τὸν ναὸν ἀπὸ τε τοῦ κηροῦ τῶν μελισσῶν καὶ ἐκ πτερῶν· πεμφθῆναι δὲ ἐς Ὑπερβορέους φασὶν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. (10) λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἕτερος λόγος, ὡς τὸν ναὸν κατεσκευάσατο ἀνὴρ Δελφός, ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῷ Πτερᾶν εἶναι· κατὰ τοῦτο οὖν γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ναῷ τοῦνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκοδομήσαντος· ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τοῦ Πτερᾶ καὶ πόλιν Κρητικὴν προσθήκη γράμματος Ἀπτερεοῦς φασιν ὀνομάζεσθαι. τὸν γὰρ δὴ λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ἐς τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν αὐξομένην πτέριν, ὡς ἐκ τῆς πῶας ταύτης χλωρᾶς ἔτι διεπλέξαντο ναόν, οὐδὲ ἀρχὴν προσέειμι τὸν λόγον τούτον. (11) τὰ δὲ ἐς τὸν τρίτον τῶν ναῶν ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐκ χαλκοῦ, θαῦμα οὐδέν, εἴ γε Ἀκρίσιος μὲν θάλαμον χαλκοῦν τῇ θυγατρὶ ἐποίησατο. Λακεδαιμονίοις δὲ Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν Χαλκιοῖκου καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς λείπεται, Ῥωμαίοις δὲ ἡ ἀγορὰ μεγέθους ἔνεκα καὶ κατασκευῆς τῆς ἄλλης θαῦμα οὖσα παρέχεται τὸν ὄροφον χαλκοῦν. οὕτω καὶ ναὸν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι οὐκ ἂν ἀπὸ γε τοῦ εἰκότος εἴη γενέσθαι χαλκοῦν. (12) τὰ μέντοι ἄλλα με οὐκ ἔπειθεν ὁ λόγος ἢ Ἡφαίστου τὸν ναὸν τέχνην εἶναι ἢ τὰ ἐς τὰς ψόδους τὰς χρυσᾶς, ἃ δὴ Πίνδαρος ἦσεν ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τῷ ναῷ· *cites lines 70–1*. οὗτος μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐς μύησιν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ Σειρήνων ἐποίησεν· οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τρόπον ὄντινα ἀφανισθῆναι συνέπεσε τῷ ναῷ, κατὰ ταῦτα εἰρημένα εὕρισκον· καὶ γὰρ ἐς χάσμα γῆς ἔμπεσεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπὸ πυρὸς τακῆναι λέγουσιν. (13) τέταρτος δὲ ὑπὸ Τροφωνίου μὲν εἰργάσθη καὶ Ἀγαμήδους, λίθου δὲ αὐτὸν ποιηθῆναι μνημονεύουσι.

(They say that originally the temple of Apollo was made of laurel, the branches of which were brought from the laurel in Tempe. The temple would have had the form of a hut. The Delphians say that the second temple was made by bees from beeswax and feathers and that it was sent to the Hyperboreans by Apollo. (10) Another story is told, that the temple was set up by a Delphian man, whose name was Pteras, and so the temple received its name from its builder. It was also after this man they say that the city of Aptereoi in Crete was named, with the addition of a letter. The story about the fern (*pterus*) that grows on the mountains, that they wove the

⁶⁷ Chronology of the construction of the fifth temple: Homolle (1902), 597 ff.; De La Coste-Messelière (1946).

temple out of fresh stalks of this, I do not accept at all. (11) It is no wonder that the third temple was made of bronze, seeing that Acrisius made a bed-chamber of bronze for his daughter, the Lacedaimonians even in our day have a sanctuary of Athena of the Bronze House, and the Roman forum, a marvel for its size and style, possesses a roof of bronze. So it would not be unlikely that a temple of bronze was made for Apollo. (12) The rest of the story I cannot believe, either that the temple was the work of Hephaestus, or the legend about the golden singers, referred to by Pindar in his verses about that temple [*cites lines 70-1*]. These words, it seems to me, are an imitation of Homer's account of the Sirens. Furthermore, I found no agreement among accounts of the way this temple disappeared. Some say that it fell into a chasm in the earth, others that it was melted by fire. (13) The fourth temple was made by Trophonius and Agamedes, and they record that it was made of stone.)

Aristotle, *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* fr. 3 Rose (from Porphyry, *Περὶ τοῦ Γνώθι σεαυτόν*, cited in Stob. 21. 26 Meineke), apropos the history of the Delphic maxim γνῶθι σεαυτόν: . . . εἴτε καὶ πρὸ Χίλωνος ἦν ἔτι ἀνάγραπτον ἐν τῷ ἰδρυθέντι νεῷ μετὰ τὸν πτέρινόν τε καὶ χαλκοῦν, καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τοῖς περὶ φιλοσοφίας εἴρηκε.

(. . . or whether before Chilon it was already written up in the temple founded after the feathered and the bronze ones, as Aristotle says in *On Philosophy*.)

Strabo, 9. 3. 9 τῶν δὲ ναῶν τὸν μὲν πτέρινον εἰς τοὺς μύθους τακτέον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον Τροφωνίου καὶ Ἀγαμήδους ἔργον φασί, τὸν δὲ νῦν Ἀμφικτύονες κατασκεύασαν.

(Of the temples, the one 'with wings' should be regarded as a myth; the second is said to be the work of Trophonius and Agamedes; and the present temple was built by the Amphictyones.)

Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, 6. 11 [*Thespiesion the gymnosophist has argued that the tradition that Apollo's temple was made of wax and feathers shows that Apollo has simple tastes. Apollonius argues to the contrary that the temple of wax and feathers was not necessarily small.*] ὁ δ' οἶμαι, μικρὰ ταῦτα ἡγούμενος καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἤττω, καὶ ἄλλου ἐδεήθη νεῷ καὶ ἄλλου καὶ μεγάλων ἥδη καὶ ἑκατομπέδων, ἐνὸς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ χρυσᾶς ἕνγας ἀνάψαι λέγεται, Σειρήνων τινὰ ἐπεχούσας πειθῷ, ξυνελέξατό τε τὰ εὐδοκιμώτατα τῶν ἀναθημάτων ἐς τὴν Πυθῶ κόσμου ἕνεκα.

(And the god, I believe, regarded even this as too humble and below the dignity of his wisdom, and therefore he desired to have another and yet another temple, big ones these, a hundred feet in breadth; and from one of them it is said that golden figures of the wryneck were hung up which possessed the charm of Sirens; and the god collected the most precious of the offerings into the Pythian temple for ornament.)

B3 (Pa. VII Ia)

str. A 1?

5? * * *
 ~?]ν.

 * * *
 ~?]ν ταχὺ[ς

15? ~?]ν πνευσ[

Π⁴ col. n-1 (=12?) σπεύδοντ', ἔκλαγξέ <θ>] ἱερ[

δαιμόνιον κέαρ ὀλοαί-

σι στοναχαῖς ἄφαρ,

καὶ τοιαῖδε κορυφᾷ σά-

20? μαινεν λόγων· ὦ παναπ.[~? εὐ-

ρ[ύ]οπα Κρονίων τελεῖς σ[

πεπρωμέναν πάθαν ἁ-

νίκα Δαρδανίδαις Ἐκάβ[

. .]ποτ' εἶδεν ὑπὸ σπλάγχ[νοις

25? φέρουσα τόνδ' ἀνέρ'. ἔδοξ[ε γὰρ

τεκεῖν πυρφόρον ἐρι[

Ἐκατόγχειρα, σκληρᾷ[

Ἴλιον πᾶσάν νιν ἐπὶ π[έδον

κατερεῖψαι· ἔειπε δὲ .[

30? ~3] .[.]αι τέρας ὑπνα[λέον

~5]λε προμάθεια

Π⁴ fr. 82; 14-15? Π⁴ fr. 96; 5? Π²⁶ fr. 29

1 ff. I assume here that B3 started in the second line of a column, basing this on my reconstruction of B2. However, other reconstructions are possible 14-15 Sn

thinks that the vertical space between the lines is too great for them to be consecutive, and he concludes that they are two non-consecutive line-ends; but inspection of fr. 96 suggests to me that they might be consecutive after all 16 GH: ΕΚΛΑΓΞΕΝΤΕΙΕ

Π⁴ ἱερ[ᾶς κόρας Robert (1914); ἱερ[ώτατον GH; ἱερ[ᾶν ὅπα Sitzler (1911a); ἱεράς Puech 19 ΑΙ ΦΑΙ 20 Π⁴: σάμαινε Π¹ λόγων Π⁴: ΛΟΓΟΝ Π¹ ΠΑΝΑΠ[:

παναπή[μον (cf. Hes. Op. 811; AG 9. 525. 17) or παναπε[ίριτε GH (cf. Andrian Hymn to Isis, 22 = Totti (1985), 6) 20-1 βα]ρύοπα Maas 21 τελεῖς Π²⁶ (τελεῖς implied in Σ): τέλει Π²⁶ σ[ὺ νῦν τὰν πάλαι GH 22-3 ἁ-|νίκα Δαρδανίδαις Ἐκάβ[α φράσεν

ὄψιν | ἄν] ποτ' GH 25 ἌΝ 26 ἐρι[σφάραγον (see fr. 6a (d); Bacch. 5. 20), ἐρι[σμάραγος (Hes. Th. 815), or ἐρι[βρεμέταν (Isth. 4. 56; Hom. Il. 13. 624) Robert (1914); ἐρι[βρομον, ἐρι[γδουπον (cf. fr. 70b = Dith. II. 12), or ἐρι[κτυπον Rutherford

27 Π⁸: -ΤΟΝΧΕΡΑ Π¹ [δὲ βίᾱ GH; [δ' ὕβρει or δ' ἀρπαγῇ Sn 28 π[έδον GH
 29 M[, N[, I[: μ[άντης Schr (1923); Αἴσακος Diehl (1917) 30 Ἄλ: σὺν δίκ]α Schr
 (1923) 31 οὐδ' ἔσφα]λε Werner (1967); ἀλλ' ἔσφα]λε Sitzler (1911a)

Σ 7-16 (Π²⁶ fr. 29. 9-13) [~? λοιμοῦ κα]τασχόντ(ος) Λακεδαιμ(ονίους)
 ἔχρη(σει) ὁ θεὸς Με[νελάω | θύειν Λύκω καὶ Χι]μαίρει πορευθέντι εἰς τῇ(ν)
 Τευκρίδ[α | ἐκεῖ δὲ ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου] ἐξενίσθη καὶ αἰθῆς ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστή(ριον)
 ἦ[λθον | ὁ μὲν περὶ παῖδ]ων γονῇ(ς), ὁ δ(ε) π(ερὶ) τῇ(ς) Ἑλένη(ς) ἀρπαγῆς
 χρησόμε(εν)ος

7 (Σ^{δ2})]πας

9 (Σ^{δ2})]ις

10 (Π⁴ fr. 82 col. 1. 10 ff.) (Σ^{δ2}) [< 20] ου ἔχρηζε | [< 20] κάτε-
 ρος | [> 20] . ψ. . το εκ[.]χε()

14 (Π⁴ fr. 96) (Σ^{δ1}) θρασύς [< 20

15 (Π⁴ fr. 96) (Σ^{δ1}) Ἀλέξανδ[ρον < 30

20 ff. (?) (Π⁴ fr. 82, above col. 2) (Σ^{δ2}) [τὸ πάθo]ς το[ῦ]το πλήρες [< 20 |
 [ἐπι]τελέσεις εὐθέως τοῖς Δ[αρδανίδαις τὸ] | ἐνύπνιον· δύ(ναται) τελέω ἐπιτε-
 λέ[ω]. < 20

31 (above line) (Σ^{δ1}) οὕτως α[< 20

8-16 suppl. Lobel

. . . fast . . . breathed . . . [seeing Paris] hastening forth, at once . . .
 her inspired heart cried aloud with grievous moanings and uttered this
 culmination of words: 'O infinite, o far-seeing son of Cronus, surely now
 you will fulfil the doom that was destined long ago, when Hekabe [told]
 the Trojans [the vision] which she saw, when she carried this man in her
 womb. She seemed to bear a fire-carrying strong- . . . Hundred-hander,
 who with his stern [strength] hurled all Ilium to the ground; and . . . told
 the marvel of her slumber. [Nor was her] forethought [mistaken].

(8 ff., Π²⁶) When plague afflicted Sparta, the god told Menelaus to travel to the
 Teucric land and sacrifice to Lycus and Chimaereus. There he was entertained by
 Alexander and together they went to the oracle again, the one to ask about having
 children, the other to ask about making off with Helen. (10, Π⁴) (the oracle) answered
 (to each?) (14, Π⁴) Bold. (15) Alexander. (16) This πάθος is full; you will complete
 immediately for the Dardanids the dream. τελέω means 'complete'. (31) Thus . . .

Immediately following B2 in the papyri was another song, the sur-
 viving section of which represents Cassandra as delivering a speech
 on the occasion of the departure of Paris from Troy for Greece. Π⁴
 fr. 82 preserves a single column of text immediately following the
 column that contained the end of B2 and the beginning of B3, to-
 gether with the ends of a couple of scholia, which more likely belong
 to B3 rather than B2. Some information about the beginning of the
 song is conveyed in a scholion preserved in Π²⁶ fr. 29. 9 ff., which
 mentions an obscure story that Paris left Troy in the company of

Menelaus—who had been instructed to come to Troy to propitiate the deities Lycus and Chimaereus as a way of averting a plague in Sparta—and that they journeyed to Delphi to consult the oracle, Menelaus honestly about procreating children, Paris dishonestly about how to seduce Helen.¹ This is an interpretation rather than a summary, and we should probably not infer that so much detail was found in the song itself. *σπεύδοντ'* (line 16) could refer to Paris hurrying to depart, or it might even be a dual referring to both him and Menelaus.

The song need not have begun with this narrative. If, for example, it began with an invocation of Delphi as a centre of prophecy (compare the openings of D6, B2), the visit of Menelaus and Paris to Delphi could have been introduced as an illustration of this (compare my suggestions about Panthoos in D6 and Trophonius at the end of B2).

The better-preserved section begins with a complex speech-frame, which we can paraphrase: someone's divine heart rang out, using 'the following culmination of words'. The latter phrase (*τοι-ᾷδ' . . . κορυφᾷ λόγων*) is on one level a periphrasis for 'the following speech'.² But there may also be a suggestion that the words issuing from the speaker's head complement the inarticulate utterance of the heart by giving expression to it.³ The identity of the speaker is unclear. Candidates include Helenus and Aisakos, but it is most likely to have been Cassandra, who is independently attested to have prophesied on this occasion. Hence we should perhaps restore something like *ἱερ[ᾶς κόρας* (with Robert) at the end of line 16.

Cassandra does not prophesy directly, but recalls an earlier portent. She begins with an address to Zeus, and says that he is bringing to pass a disaster that was already fated long before when Hekabe dreamt that Paris would destroy Troy. Hekabe dreamt that she gave birth to a *πυρφόρον ἔρι*[. . . | *ἐκατόγγχειρα*. The original editors thought that the noun here was likely to be *Ἐρινύς*, but Robert

¹ *SHom. Il.* 5. 64 (ii. 13 Erbse); *SLyc.* 132, 136 (63–5 Scheer); Parke and Wormell (1956), no. 406.

² *κορυφή*, like *κεφάλαιον*, can mean 'chief point' or 'culmination' in the context of speech; this sense occurs in the plural at *Ol.* 7. 68 and *Pyth.* 3. 80; see Nagy (1990), 237.

³ The verbs *κλάζω* and *σημαίνω* are often associated with prophecy. Aeschylus uses (–)κλάζω in connection with prophecy at *Ag.* 156, 201; *Cho.* 535; *σημαίνω* (only here in Pindar) is used of Delphi in Sim. *PMG* 511 fr. 1(a) 4; Heraclitus B 93 DK; compare also *σάμα* in prophetic context at A1. 13.

objected (1) that the gender of Ἑρι[νύν would not make it a good symbol for Paris, and (2) that iconography does not support the idea of a hundred-handed Fury. So he suggested that the noun was Ἑκατόγχειρα and ἐρ- [the first part of an adjective.⁴ Robert's point (1) does not seem decisive (a female character in a dream can represent a man: in Euripides' interpretation of Hekabe's dream a doe seems to represent Astyanax),⁵ but point (2) does seem convincing. This Hundred-hander then lays waste the whole of Ilion (28–9). This is different from the version of Hekabe's dream we find in other accounts, in which its subject was a torch.⁶

In line 29 someone interpreted the dream or gave advice about it (the subject of εἶπε). This is probably also part of Cassandra's speech. It is extremely rare in Greek lyric poetry for one speaker to recall what another speaker said: the only parallel seems to be the highly complex speech of Medea at the start of *Pythian* 4.⁷ The interpreter was probably Aisakos, as he is in the accounts of Apollodorus and Lycophron.⁸ To judge from other sources, the advice was to expose the infant Paris. Line 31 is probably a statement by Cassandra to the effect that this prudent course did not work: Paris lived.

To turn to the genre, B3 shows no sign of being any sort of cult hymn to Apollo, and prima facie does not seem to conform to any type of song that would qualify as a παιάν. Part of the explanation may be that prophecy is frequently associated with the genre.⁹ But we must assume that there were recognizable generic features in sections that are lost. For example, the song may have started with an invocation of Delphi which led to the narrative about Menelaus and Paris consulting the oracle. Again, there may have been a refrain. It is an attractive hypothesis that one, several, or all the refrains could have formed part of Cassandra's monologue and could have

⁴ C. R. Robert (1914), 316. Ἑκατόγχειρ also occurs in *POxy* 2627. 9, which may be by Pindar.

⁵ Eur. *Hec.* 90; see the commentary of Devereux (1976), 265 ff.

⁶ The sources for this are Eur. *Tro.* 922 (Helen reports that Hecabe dreamt of a δάλου πικρόν μίμημα ('bitter imitation of a torch')); Enn. fr. 17–18 (*Alexandros*) in Jocelyn (1967); Apollod. *Bibl.* 3. 12. 5; Hygin. *Fab.* 91. Euripides may also have mentioned it in the prologue of the *Alexandros*; see Webster (1967), 165 ff.; Scodel (1980), 24–5.

⁷ See Führer (1967), 95, comparing *Pyth.* 4. 40 ff., 53 ff. It is remarkable that such complexity of utterance is allowed for prophetesses only.

⁸ Apollod. *Bibl.* 3. 12. 5; Lyc. 224 ff.; C. R. Robert (1914), 318, suggested Helenus.

⁹ For prophecy as a feature of the genre see pp. 173–4.

functioned as an appeal or appeals to Apollo, with whom Cassandra had a special relationship.¹⁰ (In that case, the song would constitute an inversion of the normal convention that women do not utter *παῖάν*-cries or sing *παῖάνες*.¹¹)

The general structure of prophecy preceded by mythological introduction is analogous to Hor. *Odes*, 1. 15 ('pastor cum traheret per freta navibus . . .'), which consists of a prophecy by Nereus about the Trojan war introduced by a short speech-frame. Interestingly, Porphyryon claims that *Odes* 1. 15 is based on a song by Bacchylides with the title *Cassandra*,¹² which must have consisted largely of a prophecy delivered by Cassandra—otherwise the claim would make no sense—and may have had the same general structure as *Odes* 1. 15.¹³ If so, Bacchylides' song may have looked rather like B3, though of course we cannot be sure that Cassandra's prophecy was sustained till the end of Pindar's song.

Another text which may illuminate this song is *POxy* 2368. As I have already mentioned (§9), this papyrus preserves part of a commentary describing a dispute over the genre of a song about Cassandra: Callimachus thought it was a *παῖάν* because of the refrain, while Aristarchus believed that it was a *διθύραμβος* and called it *Cassandra*. This song is generally identified with the *Cassandra* of Bacchylides.¹⁴ However, it seems to me that it might equally well be the present song. An objection that suggests itself is that the standard edition of Pindar is supposed to date from the time

¹⁰ See Aesch. *Ag.* 1035 ff.; Davreux (1942), 29 ff., 66, 102 ff. D. Schmidt (1990) suggests that a connection with Apollo may have been brought out in the myth known to have been mentioned by Stesichorus (*PMG* 198 = Paus. 10. 27. 2), that Apollo transported Hekabe to Lycia after the sack of Troy.

¹¹ Cf. the speech of the prophetess at Lucan 1. 678 ff.: 'quo feror, o Paeon . . .?' ('where am I being carried, Paean . . .?').

¹² 23. 8 Holder (1893) 'hac ode Bacchylidem imitatur; nam ut ille Cassandram facit vaticinari futura belli Troiani, ita hic Proteum' ('In this ode he imitates Bacchylides; for as Bacchylides makes Cassandra prophesy the future of the Trojan war, so Horace gives the same prophecy to Proteus'). Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 188 ff., agree that the song owes much 'to the early type of Greek lyric, the pastiche of epic narrative'; Alfonsi (1954) suggested influence from Alc. 283. 3 ff. V; see also Page (1955), 277. Horace followed a Hellenistic model according to Pasquali (1920), 238 ff.; Sinko (1926), 138, also thinks that a Hellenistic epyllion was involved.

¹³ The occasion need not have been the same as the one in B3. Cassandra also prophesied when she recognized Paris at the games (as in Euripides' *Alexandros*: see the hypothesis of the play edited by Coles (1974), 12), when she saw messengers being sent to get wood for Paris' ship, and when Priam married Helen to Paris (Dares, *De excidio Troiae*, 8, 11). See Sinko (1926), 144.

¹⁴ Lobel, *POxy* xxxiii (1956), 51; Maehler (1970), 128–9.

of Aristophanes of Byzantium, who is later than Callimachus, but this point is not strong, because we have independent evidence that Callimachus was interested in the classification of Pindar's songs.¹⁵ Furthermore, B3 is a better candidate than the *Cassandra* for identification with the song referred to in *POxy* 2368, at least in so far as we know that it contained features that suggested identification as a *Paian* to some Hellenistic editor, whereas we have no independent reason to think that Bacchylides' *Cassandra* either was or would have been assigned to this genre. Assuming that this identification is right, it must be said that what we learn about B3 is very little; we knew it had a narrative anyway. But it is perhaps worth repeating Sourvinou-Inwood's suggestion that the basis of Aristarchus' objection to the song being classified as a *Paian* was that it presented Apollo's affair with Cassandra in a way that he felt inappropriate to a song theoretically devoted to the glory of Apollo; so the fascinating possibility arises that the speech of Cassandra in B3 may have contained criticism of Apollo.

Finally, yet another interesting parallel is provided by *PMG* 922 (not to be attributed to Pindar or Bacchylides, because of the dialect), a fragment of twenty-five lines describing a scene of war in the future tense. Someone will fill ships with young men; a woman will hear this; a son is about to be born. And there are six or seven instances of the expression *ἐὲ παιάν/παιήων*, at least some of which may represent refrains (e.g. lines 2, 17). Is this another prophet or prophetess of Apollo commenting on a birth which will lead to a war, and interrupting his or her speech with *παιάν*-cries?

B4

]

]

]νυ[. .]νῶιν

]

5]

]

B5

] [

] . ταλίσαν . [

]

]

] [

¹⁵ In the scholiasts' discussion of the genre and class of *Pyth.* 2 (Dr ii. 31.8 ff.).

Π⁴ fr. 94Π⁴ fr. 1622]ΑΙ[? 3 ΝΩΙΝ Π⁴: ΝΩΝ Π¹2]Ι or]Ν, i.e.]ντα λίαν[,]'Ιταλίαν[, or
Τα]νταλίαν[, not Κα]σταλίανΣ B4 2 (Σ^{δ1})]ντ[...]νεω (Σ^{δ2}) ὁμνε[ῖν 4 (Σ^{δ1}) Ἀρ(ιστό)[νικος]σὺν τῶ
ῖ[7 μ[8 ε.[B5 2-3 (Σ^{δ1})] ἐν καὶ πόρον α[< 20]] τουτ() κα[< 20

B4 2 GH 4 McNamee (1977); Ἀρ(ιστοταρχος) GH

B4 . . . us two

B4 . . . to sing . . . Aristonicus with the ῖ

B5 . . . in a crossing also . . .

B4. Who are 'us two'? Apollo and Artemis? Trophonius and Agamedes (B 2)? The Hellenistic editor Aristonicus is placed in context in Part I.¹

B5. The presence of scholia beneath the column suggests that the fragment comes from the bottom of a column. The scholia start a couple of letters to the left of *ταλίαν*, and this point may mark the start of the column. It has been suggested that this might represent the same text as G7. 4, but whereas in that case *Κα]σταλίαν* is the most probable reading, here it is ruled out.² The likeliest solution is probably to read *λίαν* preceded by the end of a word carried over from the previous line. Alternatives are]'Ιταλίαν, with which we might compare the theme of G9, and Τα]νταλίαν, a rare adjective cited by Stephanus of Byzantium, *Eth.* 602. 4, in the sense of 'pertaining to Tantalus' (a mountain in Lesbos).³

B6

B7

B8

B9

(Pa. VIIIa(a)) (Pa. VIIIa(b)) (Pa. VIIIa(c)) (Pa. VIIIa(d))

α]νδρος ὄτ[]	πεμ[]αιν[
]τηρῆ κα[]ανδ[]δομ[]ιππ[
]ος οὐ λυτ[]πάρ[]θυ[]αξ[
ύ]περτάτα ι[]αδιος· ι[]εμ[
5]'ου[5]· ε[5]τον[

¹ Pronoun: Braswell (1988), 233; Aristonicus: see p. 149.

² Most recently Lobel and Maehler in *POxy* lvi apropos of G7. 4.

³ See also Philostr. *Apollonii Epist.* 78. 2, i. 366. 31 Kayser.

]απ[

Π⁺ fr. 86Π⁺ fr. 92Π⁺ fr. 88Π⁺ fr. 91

B6 1 Ἀλέξα]νδρος? Lobel 2 Χίμα]ιρη; Lobel (cf. ΣB3) 3 Ὀν
 B7 2 Ἀλε]ξανδ[ρ suggested by Lobel 3 Ἀρ[: Lobel suggested Σπαρ[τα, but]Α,
]M seem more likely 4 Διός· GH; for another suggestion, p. 206 n. 1

Σ B9 (Σ^{ε1}, beneath text) 7-8 <5]απ[...θενμ[<20 | <5]...
 ων... <20

B6 . . . highest . . .

These four fragments are associated with B3 by Maehler. The hypothesis that B6 comes from the verso column immediately following receives some support from the presence of a column-end on the recto.¹

B10

B11

]λομεν]κισ[
]]λεσα
ω̂ Μοῖσαι[]]
]	
5]	
]	
]	

Π⁺ fr. 95Π⁺ fr. 144

3 Rutherford

Σ B10 2-5 (Σ^{δ2}) <5]... | <5]...σθεω (or]...ρεω) μουσα[<15
 (Σ^{ε2}) ἀκολουθ[<20 (Σ^{δ2}) <5]...τισι μετα[<15

7 <5]ν μαν[τ <15

Σ B11 1-2 (Σ^{δ2}) ~?]τε ὑπομεν[α]ι | [...]ε[ις.]

B10 O Muses

B10 (2-5) . . . Muse . . . (4) . . . follow . . . in some copies . . . (7) prophet

¹ For possible positions of this fragment based on the relative position of recto and verso columns, see Bagnall, Frier, and Rutherford (1997), 16.

B11 (1–2) . . . to withstand . . .

B10 could be from an invocation to the Muses earlier in B2.¹

¹ This hypothesis is compatible with relative positions of recto and verso columns: see Bagnall, Frier, and Rutherford (1997), 16.

Group C

C1 (*Pa.* VIIa)

. . . .] . [~3
 γον ὄμ[
 ἐννικ[
 λυπευ[
 5 ἐκ φρεν[ὸς ~13] φ. εἰς
 κλοπα[<15]
 5 κλεὸς ἔκατι <15]

Restored from Π²⁰ and Π²⁸, line-beginnings from Π²⁸ fr. 1. 1–7; the ends of lines 5–7 from Π²⁰ fr. 14 col. 1. 1–3

3 ff. το- | λυπευ[Lobel; ἀλ- | λ' ὕπ' εὐ-[, Sn 5 Sn (1962) on the basis of Σ line 6]ΦΕ,]ΦΕ better than]ΦΙ: μολπὰν ἀ]φίεις Sn from Σ, λόγος ρί]φθείς, πεμ]φθείς, μεμ]φθείς?
 6 κλοπα[₅ ἄτερ Sn 7 ΚΛΕΘΣΕ Π: Κλεὸς ἔκατι Σ*Nem.* 2, B; Κλειός PU; Κλέος D; Κλειούς T

Σ 6 (Π²⁰)]ν ἀληθῇ κ(αῖ) οὐ ψευδῇ
 7 (Π²⁰) ζῆ(τεῖται) κλεοῦς ἔκατ[ι |]θῆσω μολπὰν ῖ. [~3
 7 ἰδί[or ἰᾶΛ[

(5) from the heart . . . (7) for the sake of Kleo . . .

(6) true and not false; (7) there is a problem about 'for the sake of Kleo'; I will start song and dance.

The end of a song, dealing with poetry. Lines 3–4 may contain the verb *τολυπεύω* ('wind off in a ball, accomplish'). The sense of lines 5–6 was something like *ἐκ φρεν[ὸς φωνὰν ἀ]φίεις | κλοπᾶς ἄτερ* ('sending out a voice from the heart without deceit'). In line 7 Lobel restored *Κλεὸς ἔκατι* from a scholion to *Nem.* 2. 11.¹ In ending

¹ Dr iii. 35. 16, cited to illustrate Pindar's supposed practice of dropping -υ-, *Κλεοῦς* being the expected form. The manuscripts give a variety of forms: *Κλεός* B; *Κλειός* PU; *Κλέος* D; *Κλειούς* T. The reading of D has the wrong accent for a form of *Κλεῶ*, while that of T is ruled out because the form is supposed to lack υ. Of *Κλεός* and *Κλειός*, the former is the *lectio difficilior* since *Κλεῶ* is the usual form of the name. Compare the variation *κλεοῖ/κλειοῖ* in *POxy* 3696, 6. From the Σ Lobel suggested that the form *κλεός* found its way into the lexica (*EM* 517. 25; *EGud* (Sturz) 326. 3; *EGen* (ined) cod. A).

with a reference to Kleo, this song finds a parallel in *Nem.* 3. 83–4. The short genitive *Κλεός* would be unique. Veneri points to parallel formations in an inscription from Rhodes, a sacred law from Cyrene, and a Delphian inscription.² The evidence is ambiguous, but the Rhodian and Cyrenaean parallels might be thought to suggest at least that this was a Doric form.³ However, there is reason to doubt whether the form really occurs in Pindar: the two forms would have both been spelt ΚΛΕΟΣ in the original script, so the argument for *Κλεός* would have to be based on scansion. But the accompanying scholion seems to give *Κλεοῦς* *ἔκατι* as an alternative form, and if this alternative is metrically legitimate, then either the second syllable of the last line was anceps, or the second syllable of *Κλεός* was lengthened by the fossilized digamma in *ἔκατι* anyway.⁴

C2 (Pa. VIIb)

str. A	⌘	Ἀπολλο	[ν -- υ υ -	
Π[~15]	[.]αις	σέ καί	[υ υ - υ ⓧ	
εις	Δῆλο	ματέρ[< 12	
		παιαν[~10] . [.] ι []
	5	στεφ[~10] εὐανθέος
Π ⁺ col. 1		ἔρνεσ[~8] α . .
		μή μο[ι	~8] υς
		ἄρχομ[~8] ραν
		ῥωῖ[~9] χων
	10	κελαδίσσαθ'	ῥμ, νους,	9
		Ὀμήρου	[~4	τρι] πτον κατ' ἀμαξιτὸν
		ιόντες, ἀ[~5	ἀλ] λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις
		ἐπεὶ αυ[~6	π] τανὸν ἄρμα
		Μοισα[~10] μεν.

² Veneri (1977), 55: Φιλτός (the short quantity of the second syllable guaranteed by metre) in an inscription on a kylix from Camirus on Rhodes, c. 490 BC (= *IG* xii/1. 719), λέχος in a sacred law from Cyrene (*LSCGS*, no. 115 B 27), Λατός in *DGEEP* 325 (treaty between Delphi and Pellane).

³ Veneri suggests that it is a pre-Doric Aeolic substrate, arguing that it might be a feature shared by Boeotian (her suggestion that C1 could be the end of the Theban song D7 seems misplaced, however).

⁴ So Gallavotti (1979), 255; Gallavotti also argues for different scansion of the Rhodian inscription. There is a good discussion in Bona (1988), 153–6.

- 15 ἐ]πεύχο[μαι] δ' Οὐρανοῦ τ' ἐϋπέπλω θυγατρὶ
 Μναμ[ο]σύ[ν]α κόραισί τ' εὐ-
 μαχανίαν διδόμεν.
 τ]υφλα[ῖ γὰ]ρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες 15
 ὅ]στις ἀνενθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων
 — βαθεῖαν ε. .[. .]ων ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν.
- ant. A 21 ἐμοῖ δὲ τοῦτο[ν δ]ιέδω-
 κ.ν] ἄθανάτ[ο]ν πόνον
- Π⁴ col. 2 [< 17]
 [δέλτου 3
- (lines 25–30 missing)
- [~20] .[] .
 32 [~20] . . . [.] . . το·
 [λέχρσ] π . . . ἔσθα[ι] 12
 [~20] .[] .
 35 [υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ πατ]ρῶαν Ἐκἀέρ-
 γ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-
 [-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-
 Π⁴ col. 3 ἔδο[ξ υ-υ-υ-υ- 15
 α[υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-]νους
 — δ[υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ]ο ἔσσατο
- ep. A 41 [~6] α[
 .]υνας· τί πείσομα[ι
 ἦ Διὸς οὐ ἐθέλο[ισα
 Κοίου θυγάτηρ π[3
 45 ἄπιστά μ[ο]ι δέδο[ι]κα καμ[
 δέ μιν ἐν πέλ[α]χ[ο]ς
 ῥιφθεῖσαν εὐαγέα πέτραι φανῆναι
 καλέοντί μιν Ὀρτυγίαν ναῦται πάλαι 6
 πεφόρητο δ' ἐπ' Αἰγαῖον θαμά,
 50 τᾶς ὁ κρᾶτιστος
 ἐράσσατο μιχθεῖς 9
 τοξοφόρον τελέσαι γόνον
- Π⁴ col. 4 [
 [
 55 .[

α[
.]

Material is provided by Π⁴, Π²⁶, and Π²⁸; 1–10 (left-hand) from Π²⁸ fr. 1. 8–18; 1–19 (right-hand) from Π²⁶ fr. 14(a) col. 1, 3a–24; 6–22 from Π⁴ fr. 16; 11–17 from Π²⁶ fr. 14(b); 11–14 from Π⁴ fr. 17–19; 23–35 from Π⁴ fr. 19 col. 1; 38–52 from fr. 19 col. 2; 38–40 (right-hand) from Π⁴ fr. 20; 47–57 from Π²⁶ fr. 14(a) col. 2. 10–20 (precise correlation with the rest of the poem uncertain: see p. 252 n. 33)

TITLE Π[in Π²⁸, remainder in Π²⁶ (in text in both); Π[ΑΛΛ]ΗΝΙ[Τ]ΑΙΣ Sn; Π[ΑΙΑΝ ΠΡΟΣΩΔΙΑΚΟΣ ΔΗΛΙ]ΑΞ[Τ]ΑΙΣ Rutherford; or perhaps the two papyri have different titles 1 Lobel 2 Τ[Γ[Π[? 3 Third letter might be Φ, Ρ, Ψ Ρ[Τ[5 ff. In Π²⁶ it is unclear whether there are one or two lines between]ευανθεος and line 8, so the correlation with the beginnings of the lines in Π²⁸ is uncertain; cf. Lobel 42 6 ΕΡ or ΕΡ 7 Η suppl. Sn 9 ἴ[10 κελαδήσαθ' ὕμνους (Σ) seems rather short: κελαδήσομεν D'Alessio (1988) 11 [δὲ μὴ Sn; [μὲν οὐ Newman (1986); [έκας D'Alessio (1995) τρι]πτὸν Lobel ap. Pfeiffer (1949–53); ἀτρι]πτον D'Alessio (1995); πολύτρι]πτον Werner (1967) 12 ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτρίαις Lobel ap. Sn; μ[ήτ' ἀλ]λοτρίαις Koenen ap. Bing (1984); ἀ[λλ' οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις Di Benedetto (1991); Συρίαις GH; ἀ[νθόρετ', ἀ[ερθῆτ' Rutherford; e.g. ἀ[μπτᾶσθ', ἀ[μβᾶτ' Was 13 αὐ or αὐ[τοί Sn ΤΑΝ 14 Μοισᾶ[ν or Μοισα[ῖον; ἐξέύξα]μεν or ἀνέβα]μεν Sn; ἐλαύνο]μεν Di Benedetto (1991) 15 ἘΨΠΕΠΑΩΙ Π⁴; εὐπέπλω Sn 15–19 suppl. GH 20 ΑΕ[or ΑΘ[rather than Μ.[]Τ,]Γ, perhaps]C ἐλα[ύ]νων D'Alessio (1995); ἐμ[πα]τῶν Sn; ἐλ[θόν]των GH; ἰλ[γ]γῶν Sandys (1915); ἐκ θ[να]τῶν Sitzler (1911a), εὐθ[ρό]νων Schr (1923), both palaeographically unlikely ΦΙΑC Π²⁶, which GH had conjectured on the basis of Α1. 4; ΦΙΑC Π⁴, followed by Becker (1937) 21 διέδω-[καν] GH; εἴτ' Sn 22 -καν or -κεν ΠΟΡΟΝ Π⁴, followed by Becker 32]. ΑΤ[]ΑΥΤΟ GH 35 Π⁴, suppl. Sn:]ΡΩΙΟΝ Π⁴ 35–6 ΕΡ, i.e. -έργου or -έργω 38 ΕΔΟ[40 traces of a παράγραφος 42 ΝΑC; ε]ύνᾱς GH, but the accent suggests -σ]ύνᾱς ΠΕΙCΟΜ Π⁴; ΠΕΙΘΟΜ Π⁴ 43 ἐθέλο[ισ' ἐμβῆναι λέχος Sn 44 π[όντονδ' ἐφυγεν Sn 45 ΚΑΜ[, ΚΑΙC[, etc.: κάσ[εβῆ λέγειν· φάτις Sn, Wil 46 ΝΙΝ Π⁴ ΕΝ Π⁴: ΑΝ Π⁴ πέλ[α]χ[ο]ς Wil (1922): πελ[ά]γε[ι] GH 47 ΕΥΑΥΓΕΑ Π⁴ 48 κάλ[ε]όν τε Blass ap. GH 50 ΚΑΡΤΙCΤΟC Σ

Σ 2 (Π²⁶) ζη[< 10]
5 (Π²⁶) [~?]. .ης πανηγυρε
10 (Π⁴ (Σ⁸²), Π²⁶) κελαδήσαθ' ὕμνους
21 (Π²⁶) [< 20]...τῇ....
25 (Π⁴ (Σ⁸²)) δέλτοϋ
27 (Π⁴) λήγει] εις σ
33 (Π⁴ (Σ⁸¹)) λέχος ἐπὶ τὴν λοχείαν
38 (Π⁴ (Σ⁸¹)) (above column) [< 5]ον λέγει ἀπ[ο]ρίᾳ[ν ἔχειν [?]/[?]
πὸ λ]λήν
41 (Π⁴ (Σ⁸²)) [< 5]. ναχέ[< 25]
50 (Π⁴ (Σ⁸¹)) κάρτιστος
58 (Π⁴) [< 5]τρ[< 15]
38 Sn 41 ν]αυγέ[α GH;]εναγέ[α Sn

Apollo . . . you and . . . mother . . . paeon . . . wreath . . . flowery . . . branches . . . not to me . . . begin . . . heroic . . . (10 ff.) sing hymns, not going along the worn wagon-track of Homer, [but] on the mares of another [alternatively: going along the worn wagon-track of Homer, [but not] on the mares of another], for [we are driving] the winged chariot of the Muses. I pray to the well-robed daughter of Uranus, Mnemosyne, and her girls to provide capability. For blind are the minds of men, whoever . . . seeks out the deep path of wisdom without the Heliconian Muses. But they have given me this immortal task. . . . tablet . . . couch . . . ancestral the Far-shooter . . . seemed . . . founded . . . What will I believe? That the daughter of Coeus was unwilling to [enter the bed of Zeus, and fled to the sea.] I fear that I am saying things unbelievable and [unclear?]. But they say that she was flung into the sea and appeared as a conspicuous rock. Sailors have long called it Ortygia. It often travelled over the Aegean, until the strongest one desired to unite with her and produce arrow-bearing offspring.

(10) Sing songs. (25) Tablet. (27) (It ends) in sigma. (33) λέχος applied to childbirth. (38) He says he has great perplexity (?).

The title partially preserved in the papyrus specifies Delos as the place of performance, but it does not allow us to identify the performers.¹ For the opening we have only the left edge of the column. The song began with an address to Apollo, and a 'mother' (compare D3. 6), probably Leto. *παιαν*[in line 4 could be a reference to the song (a generic signature). The wreaths and branches mentioned in lines 5–6 may have had a role in the festival referred to in the scholion on line 5.² The sense of lines 7 ff. may have been 'do not be angry with me as I start (*ἀρχομ[ένω]*?) this song'.³ In line 9 *ῥρωϊ* may be the dative singular of *ῥρως* or a form of *ῥρώϊος* or *ῥρωῖς*. The most famous Delian hero was Anios the Archegete, but he was not closely connected with the cult of Apollo, and his shrine, the Archegesion, was some distance north-east of the *ἱερόν*.⁴ The reference is more likely to be to the Hyperborean maidens who were supposed to be buried in the *ἱερόν* and were an integral part of the Delian cult of Apollo.⁵

¹ For the title see the apparatus.

² For crowns in Delian cult see Blech (1982), 235 ff. The mark above *ἐρνεσ*[could well be a rough breathing, and it could be reliable (*contra* Lobel); see *DELG* s.v., who compares Ibycus, *PMG* 286. 5 *σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἐρνεσιν* ('under the shady bows'), with Schwyzler (1939–53), i. 306.

³ For such formulae see p. 74.

⁴ Cf. Bruneau (1970), 413 ff.; Càssola (1954).

⁵ Her. 4. 33–4 (the only classical source on the subject) distinguishes two pairs of Hyperborean maidens, (1) Hyperoche and Laodice, whose *σῆμα* was on the left of the entrance to the temple of Artemis, and (2) Arge and Opis, whose *θήκη* was

The passage of metapoetic comment that follows in lines 11–12 poses an unusual textual challenge. In the standard reconstruction it has been assumed that the χορός were saying that they were travelling not on the well-worn wagon-track of Homer but on the mares of someone else: . . . 'Ομήρου [μὲν οὐ τρι]πτὸν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν | ἰόντες, ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις . . . This was the form of the text I assumed when I published on this passage in 1988, arguing that the reference to Homer was most likely to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*,⁶ which was believed to be by Homer in the fifth century BC,⁷ and that Pindar was intending to distance himself from this model. I argued that the 'another' referred to in line 12 would be Pindar, described thus from the point of view of the χορός, who would speak in their own person.⁸ I also argued that this distancing probably involved not just form but also content,⁹ and that we could find examples of this in the treatment of the myth of the birth later on in this song and also in G1, particularly in the much greater

behind the temple of Artemis near the ἐστιάτοριον of the Ceians (4. 35). On modern attempts to locate the tombs see Bruneau (1970), 45 ff.

⁶ Rutherford (1988). Bing (1988), 104, points out that the idea that Pindar refers to the *Homeric Hymn* was first suggested by Treu (1967), 151 and n. 11.

⁷ Thuc. 3. 104. 4–6 attributes lines 146 ff. and 165 ff. to Homer. West (1975), 166, suggests that belief in Homeric authorship for the *Hymn* is also indicated by Ar. *Birds*, 575 Ἴρυν δέ γ' Ὀμηρος ἔφασκε ἰκέλην εἶναι τρήρωνι πελειῇ ('Homer said that Iris was like a trembling dove'), which may allude to *HH Ap.* 114, where Iris and Eileithuia are compared to τρήρῳσι πελειάσῳ, since this simile is not used of Iris in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. Since all this evidence relates to the Delian part of the *Hymn*, it remains possible that the Pythian part was not regarded as the work of Homer in the 5th cent. BC; it may have been thought to have been added by a rhapsode such as Cynaethus (see *ΣNem.* 2. 1 (Dr iii. 29. 9 ff.)). Janko (1982) has reasserted the view that the Delian part of the *Hymn* is earlier than the Pythian part, concluding that the former dates from the 7th cent. BC (114–15) and the latter from 585 BC (132).

⁸ For the speaking subject see pp. 67–8. Slater (1969a), s.v. ἵππος, suggested that it might mean 'belonging to the Muses'.

⁹ Elsewhere when Pindar refers to Homer it is subject-matter that interests him, e.g. at *Nem.* 7. 21 ff., where Homer is criticized for allowing himself to be taken in by the misrepresentations of Odysseus (Köhnken (1971), 50 ff.). Again, on other occasions where Pindar uses the 'path of poetry' metaphor, the point has to do with subject-matter, e.g. in the context of digressions (*Nem.* 4. 69; *Pyth.* 11. 38; *Pyth.* 4. 247; *Nem.* 6. 53; *Ol.* 9. 80; Becker (1937), 68 ff.; Durante (1971–4), ii. 123 ff.), so that it would be surprising if the contrast drawn at C2. 11 was not about content, or at least content as well as form. So the programmatic image of contrasting paths of poetry at Call. *Aet.* fr. 1. 25 ff. (generally agreed to be modelled on C2. 11: see van Groningen (1963), 128; Richardson (1985); Newman (1967), 182; Di Benedetto (1991), 174 ff.; Asper (1997), 64–72) seems to concern both form and content.

role played by Zeus in Pindar's accounts of the birth than in the *Homeric Hymn*.¹⁰

Any chance that the interpretation of these lines had reached closure was exploded by the demonstration by D'Alessio (in a paper given at the Cairo Papyrological Congress in 1988) that the lacuna in line 12 is too long for the conventional reconstruction. This supported the hypothesis that ἀλλοτρίαις in line 12 was preceded by some sort of negative:¹¹ the singers thus say they are neither following Homer, nor riding the horses of anyone else, but are themselves driving a winged chariot (the contrast that this raises between self and other in the context of poetics is similar to that described in the parabasis of Aristophanes' *Wasps* (line 1022), which may be influenced by this passage).

Building on D'Alessio's work, Di Benedetto offered a new interpretation of line 11 in 1991. He argued that the singers declare that Homer is their model.¹²

Ὅμηρου [πολύτρι]πτον κατ' ἀμαξιτόν
 ἰόντες, ἀ[λλ' οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις
 ἐπεὶ αὐ[τοὶ τὸ πο]τανὸν ἄρμα
 Μοισα[ῖον ἐλαύνο]μεν.

(. . . going along the much-worn wagon-track of Homer, but not on the mares of another, since we ourselves are driving the winged chariot of the Muses.)

Di Benedetto's reconstruction would undermine my own earlier argument that Pindar intends explicitly to distance himself from the *Homeric Hymn*, since the relationship to Homer implied would be one of banal dependence.

More recently still, D'Alessio has reasserted in a way compatible with the longer lacunae the interpretation that Pindar is distancing himself from Homer, supplementing thus:¹³

Ὅμηρου [ἐκὰς ἄτρι]πτον κατ' ἀμαξιτόν
 ἰόντες, ἀ[εὶ οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις . . .

(. . . far from Homer, always going along the unworn wagon-track, not on the mares of another . . .)

D'Alessio regards it as implausible that the singers could characterize their song as a path that is already well-trodden, so that there

¹⁰ See below on G1, pp. 369–71.

¹¹ See D'Alessio (1992c).

¹² Di Benedetto (1991). According to Bing (1988), 2 n. 5, L. Koenen suggested μήτ', with 'new' as a translation for ἀλ]λοτρίαις.

¹³ See D'Alessio (1995).

is no alternative to the untrodden path of the older interpretation; he makes a case for the influence here of Parmenides' description of the remote path of Truth.¹⁴ And if the path is an untrodden one, it is difficult to see how line 11 can be reconstructed without assuming that the singers are rejecting the Homeric model. D'Alessio's analysis seems the most plausible thus far presented, and while it is unlikely that the last word has been said on these lines, it seems reasonable to suppose that the chorus are after all distancing themselves from Homer.

From here on the text is easier. The singer makes an elaborate appeal to Mnemosyne and the Muses, an appeal consisting of four sections: the statement that the *χορός* are riding in the chariot of the Muses (lines 13–14); the prayer to Mnemosyne and the Muses for capability (*εὐμαχανία*) (lines 15–17);¹⁵ a sort of explanatory section (lines 18–20), comparable to the 'sanction' in more conventional prayers,¹⁶ in which the *χορός* state that anyone who travels without the help of the Muses is blind (a passage to which Plato makes allusion in the *Phaedrus*);¹⁷ and, finally, at the start of the antistrophe (lines 21 ff.), a statement that someone, probably the Muses, has given the *χορός* an immortal labour,¹⁸ presumably the labour of taking part in the festival, which can claim to be 'immortal' in the sense that it is repeated every time the festival is held.¹⁹ Since the general emphasis in the passage is on Muses as

¹⁴ DK 28 B 1. 27; cf. B 6. 5.

¹⁵ So at *Isth.* 4. 1–3, where the athletic successes of Melissus provide a theme for song. In the same way *εὐμαχανία* (as at D6. 10) is a technical term for having nothing to say.

¹⁶ Here the 'sanction' unusually follows the request (it usually precedes); for the sanction see Ausfeld (1903); Bowra (1964), 200; Danielewicz (1974). Another example is D6. 54 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. §14 n. 1.

¹⁸ The reading of Π⁴ was originally *πόρον*, but it has been corrected to *πόνον*. Becker (1937), 76, argues for *πόρον* (with *ἀθανάτ[α]*), not *ἀθάνατ[ο]*, though the idea of 'immortal path' is found at D3. 16), comparing Pindar's use of *ἀπορος* at *Nem.* 4. 71 and *Ol.* 1. 52; he could also have cited lines 7–8 of the *ῥυμος* (or *παϊάν*?) to Tyche, *PMG* 1019 τὸ δ' ἄμαχανίας πόρον εἶδες ἐν ἄλγεσι | καὶ λαμπρὸν φάος ἄγαγες ἐν σκότει, προφερεστάτα θεῶν ('You found a path for helplessness in pain, and you brought a bright light in the darkness, most superior of deities'). Despite the attractions of *πόρον*, however, it is safer to defer to the superscription, which also has its attractions (see the next note).

¹⁹ *ἀθάν[ατος] πόνος* is a possible supplement at D6. 50. The representation of indefinite renewal as immortality in sacred contexts is discussed by Vidal-Naquet (1981), 263–4 (=translation, 196–7). In a fragment from the end of a *Paian* by Simonides (*PMG* 519 fr. 35. 6; see Rutherford (1990), 175), the *χορός* say *π[ό]νον*

bestowers of wisdom, particularly in matters of religion, the distinctively Hesiodic epithet 'Heliconian' in the third section can be explained not just as reflecting Pindar's specially Boeotian allegiances, but also, perhaps, as an allusion to the didactic nature of Hesiodic poetry.²⁰

Of the antistrophe, little survives: the word *δέλτου* in line 24 might refer to poetics;²¹ *πατρῶαν Ἑκαέρι-|γ* in lines 35–6 probably does not refer to Artemis (the epithet *πατρῶος* is not found of her); perhaps the thought was 'the Far-worker guards his ancestral land';²² and a scholion to line 38 seems to say that someone (the speaking subject, the god?) has great difficulty.

The second surviving section of C2 comes from the epode and describes the flight of Asteria, daughter of Coeus and sister of Leto,²³ from the embraces of Zeus and her transformation into an island. In terms of mythical time, this episode is a prelude to the main story of Zeus' seduction of Leto. Why Zeus first pursued one sister and then, rebuffed, turned to the other is left unexplained; perhaps he knew from a prophecy that he would father a child on a daughter of Coeus. On one level the story is an embarrassment for Zeus, but on another it illustrates his providence, because when Leto was pregnant the island was there to receive her.²⁴

The articulation of the myth is framed in doubt. The narrator begins by asking whether to lend credence²⁵ to the story that Asteria

ὑπομύνομεν ('we undertake the labour'); also Pind. fr. 70c (*Dith.* III) 16–17; *Nem.* 3. 12.

²⁰ At *Op.* 658–9 Hesiod says that he dedicated the prize of a tripod with handles that he won at Chalcis to the Muses of Helicon, when he crossed from Aulis; Pindar uses the epithet 'Heliconian' of the Muses at *Isth.* 2. 33–4 and at *Isth.* 8. 57; the epithet 'Heliconian' is used with similar implications by Ibycus, *PMG* 282. 23 ff., which perhaps alludes to Hesiod; see Barron (1969).

²¹ Elsewhere *δέλτος* occurs in contexts relating to poetics, e.g. Eur. *IA* 798, Call. *Aet.* fr. 1. 21 ff. (see Pfeiffer ad loc.).

²² *πατρῶος* is used of land at D6. 106. We cannot even rule out the possibility that *Ἑκαέρι-|γ* could be the Hyperborean maiden Hecaege (on whom see Bruneau (1970), 45–8).

²³ 'The daughter of Coeus' is elsewhere Leto, as at G 1. 13, *HH Ap.* 62; Sappho (?) 44a. 2V; Aristonoos, *παίδαν*, 5–6; *Κοιῆς* at Call. *Hy.* 4. 150; *Κοιογενῆς* at Pind. fr. 33d 3; *Κοιογένεια* A.R. 2. 710.

²⁴ The providence of Zeus: see p. 366.

²⁵ As G. B. D'Alessio points out to me, there is no need to assume that Asteria speaks, *contra* the interpretation of SnMae, followed by Führer (1967), 78 n. 10, taking *ἦ* from *ἡμί*.

was thrown into the sea;²⁶ and he seems to decide that this myth is unbelievable.²⁷ It is unclear whether these reservations amount to the outright rejection of a myth of the type that Pindar claims to make at *Ol.* 1. 51 ff. or whether he intends merely to indicate embarrassment at the incredible nature of the myth without full rejection of it, rather as in *Ol.* 9. 35 ff. he rejects the story of Heracles fighting with the gods on moral grounds without saying that it is false.²⁸ The second alternative seems slightly preferable, since as far as we can see he does not say that the story is false. In any case the rhetorical effect will be to reinforce what follows: '(about Zeus' attempted rape of Asteria) I have doubts, but it is said (and here I am more confident) that she was thrown into the sea'. After her *καταποντισμός* Asteria 'appeared as a conspicuous rock' (line 47), probably an allusion to a folk etymology of the name 'Delos' from the adjective *δῆλος* ('clear').²⁹ The island then wandered over the sea. What happens next depends on how we interpret *τᾶς* in line 50: it could be a genitive pronoun, presumably the object of *ἐράσσατο*;³⁰ more probably it means 'until', as was suggested by Schmidt, and the meaning is that the island wandered until Zeus desired to father Apollo and Artemis (lines 50–2).³¹ The second interpretation seems easier if *τᾶς* can bear this meaning, but we cannot rule out the first possibility either.

The next event was the rooting down of Delos to the sea-bed, which Zeus will have willed in order to provide a place for Leto to give birth. Since the song probably had only one triad (to judge

²⁶ For *ρίφθεισαν* in line 47 cf. *ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσιν* in the description of Delos at fr. 33d. 2–3, and for *πεφόρητο* in line 49, *φορητά* in fr. 33d. 1.

²⁷ Asyndeton is normal in such statements (*Ol.* 1. 52; *Nem.* 9. 33), so *ἅπιστα* could well be the first word of a sentence.

²⁸ *Ol.* 1 is discussed by Köhnken (1974); Nagy (1986) = (1990), 116 ff.; the passage of *Ol.* 9 is discussed by Stinton (1976), 67 ff.; Privitera (1986).

²⁹ Cf. Call. *Hy.* 4. 53 ff.; Arist. fr. 488 Rose; Pliny, *NH* 4. 12. 66. On the similar allusion in fr. 33c 6 see p. 371.

³⁰ I owe this suggestion to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones; Snell tries to make *τᾶς* work as a pronoun by supplementing *Λατὼ Κρονίδας ἐπ' ἀσφαλεῖ πέδῳ* at lines 53 ff., i.e. taking it as going with a hypothetical reference later in the sentence to 'steady ground' on which Zeus desired that Leto give birth.

³¹ V. Schmidt (1975), 39 ff., suggested that *τᾶς* and *τέως* develop from **tāos* in the same way as *ᾄς* and *ἔως* develop from *āos*. He finds evidence for the form in (1) Hesychius' information, iv. 135 Schmidt, that *τάως* is a Cretan form for *τέως*; (2) *θᾶς* meaning 'until' in Alc. 70. 8V and 206. 6V, the aspiration arising from the loss of *F*; (3) places in Homer where *τέως* scans \sim (*τᾶος*) or \sim (*τᾶς*). GH suggested emending to *ᾄς* (= *ēws*) in the sense of 'until' (elsewhere Pindar uses this only at *Ol.* 10. 51 in the sense of 'while'), which was accepted by Bowra and Turyn.

from Π²⁶, in which a space after the coronis at the end of the triad probably indicates an interlinear title),³² and since the triad probably ended in line 57 or shortly afterwards,³³ the rooting down of Delos must have been dealt with very briefly and the birth stated without any elaboration, especially since the song may have ended with a closural formula.³⁴ Perhaps there was a detailed account of the birth earlier on in the lacuna between the two surviving fragments (compare λέχος restored in line 33).

By way of conclusion, it is worth reviewing the song's relationship to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Many of the details of the narrative in the *Paian* are absent from the *Hymn*, which does not mention Asteria, says nothing about the origins of Delos or the idea of the floating island, and makes no allusion to the meaning of Δῆλος in Greek. Furthermore, in calling Delos Ortygia, Pindar seems to be going against the *Hymn* (lines 14–16), which regards them as different places.³⁵ I would take these discrepancies to corroborate my interpretation of lines 11 ff. as announcing a qualified μίμησις of the *Homeric Hymn*, acknowledging its status as the authoritative model but allowing for a considerable degree of innovation in the details of the myth.³⁶

C3 (*Pa.* VIIc)

str. A <⌘> [
 []ῖων
 []

³² *Contra* Rutherford (1988); see D'Alessio (1992c), 354–5.

³³ Snell (1962), 5, argued that the poem ended at line 57 on the grounds that the first letters of lines 48–50 can be made out in Π²⁶ fr. 14, col. ii. 11–13. But only the τ in line 13 of the fragment is certain and, moreover, the trace in line 14 does not look like the ε that would be required but more like the tip of a sloping stroke suggestive of α, δ, or λ. This reconstruction was the basis for Snell's belief that the columns of Π²⁶ had 39 lines: see p. 165.

³⁴ For closural formulae see p. 75.

³⁵ Lines 14–16 should not be regarded as an interpolation: see Càssola (1975), 486–7; Miller (1986), 17 ff. Eichgrün (1961), 260 n. 38, agrees that C2 reacts against the tradition. Lyc. 401 describes Delos as ὄρνυγος πετρομένης, and a scholiast explains that Asteria transformed herself into a quail before a second transformation into an island; perhaps this transformation was mentioned earlier in C2. Elsewhere in Pindar Ortygia is an island off Syracuse (*Ol.* 6. 92; *Pyth.* 2. 6; *Nem.* 1. 2).

³⁶ Contrast D'Alessio (1995), who argues that the implied difference between Pindar and the *Homeric Hymn* has to do with literary form, not content.

	[]. [3
5	[]ον τέλος ἔσται	
	[]υχα· συ[. . .]θμον	
	[]περαίνους	6
	[]ν ἀπὸ καὶ πατρός· ὑμ-	
(Π ⁴ col. 5)	[-	

Π⁴ fr. 21; space for title in Π²⁶ fr. 14(a) col. ii; the hypothesis that fr. 21 is from col. iv of this section is consistent with the recto of the fragment, which shows a blank space before BRO

5 ἀμα,υρ]δὸν Sn (from Σ) 6 ΧΑΙ: τ]ύχα GH; ε]ύχα Turyn]ΘΜΟΝ rather than Α]ΘΑΙΟΝ (not]ΑΝΟΝ); σὺ [δ' 'Ισ]θμὸν Sn; [τε]θμὸν Turyn 8-9 ὑμ- [ν GH

Σ 7 (Π⁴) (Σ^{δ1}) ἀμα[υρδὸν] (Σ^{δ2}) ἔσσεται

7 Sn

The end (rite?) will be . . . may you accomplish . . . and from the father. Hymn(s) . . .

(7) Dark. It will be.

Unclear. The future tense (line 5) suggests a prophecy. But it is more likely that the subject is a rite: the worshippers undertake to perform it (*do*) and they pray: 'May you (the deity) accomplish something' (*des*) in response.

C4

] . . .
]ν
]ς ἰση̃ ἔπε[
]
 5]

Π⁴ fr. 22

3]ΞΙΣΗ̃ΕΠΕ[: ἰση̃ (from ἴσαμι) GH

. . . you should know (?) . . .

Group D

D1 (Pa. I)

col. 1 πρὶν ὀδυνηρὰ γήραος σ[. . . . μ]ολεῖν,
 πρὶν τις εὐθυμία σκιαζέτω
 νόημ' ἄκοτον ἐπὶ μέτρα, ἰδὼν
 [—] δύναμιν οἰκόθετον.
 5 ἰὴ ἰή, νῦν ὁ παντελής Ἐνιαυτὸς
 ὦρα[ι] τε Θεμίγονοι
 πλάξ]ιππον ἄστν Θήβας ἐπῆλθον
 Ἀπόλ]λωνι δαῖτα φιλησιστέφανον ἄγοντες.
 Παιὰ]ν δὲ λαῶν γενεὰν δαρὸν ἐρέπτοι
 [—] 10 σαό]φρονος ἄνθεσιν εὐνομίας.

Π* col. 1

TITLE [ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ἸΣΜΗΝΙΟΝ] Sn 1 Π: ὀδυνηρὰ Schr (1908) (transmitted at
Pyth. 2. 91) σ[χεδὸν μ] GH; σ[ταθμὰ Wil (1921); σ[άματα Turyn 3 ἄκοτον
 Mulbegaat-Holler (1927) 7 Housman (1908), who also suggested λεύκ]ιππον
 9 D'Alessio (1988a) 10 D'Alessio (1988a)

Σ 3 (Σ^{ε2}) μετρίως

Before drawing near to the painful . . . of old age, before let a man place his peaceful mind in the shadow of gladness in accordance with moderation, when he has seen the wealth that is stored in his home. *Ie ie.* Now the complete Year and the Seasons, the daughters of Themis, have come to Thebes, city that drives horses, bringing to Apollo the banquet that loves the garland. Long may Paian crown the progeny of her peoples with the flowers of temperate lawfulness.

3 Moderately

D1 is the end of a cult song of unknown length.¹ ἰὴ ἰή in line 5

¹ Irigoin (1952), 83, supposed that D1 is the end of C2. Against this is the lack of fit between the metre of the two fragments and the fact that C2 was performed on Delos (see the title), whereas D1 seems to relate to a Theban festival. However, it is not impossible that E1, which contains a reference to Thebes, belongs to D1, as may be the case with F3—a testimonial fragment referring to Thebes.

perhaps marks the start of the final epode.² The reference to Thebes in line 7 suggests that the performers were Thebans. In the four lines before the epode the subject is the individual and his *οἶκος*, in the epode it is the broader community of the *πόλις*. In the earlier section the singer expresses the view that someone should relax at home before reaching old age, in language that suggests the elegiac poetry of Mimnermus (*IEG* 1. 5 ff. *ἐπεὶ δ' ὀδυνηρόν ἐπέλθῃ | γῆρας* ('When painful old age comes')).³ The theme of domestic peace is reminiscent of Bacch. fr. 4 (a *Paian*), 75 ff.:

χαλκεῶν δ' οὐκ ἔστι σαλπίγγων κτύπος,
οὐδὲ σὺλάται μελίφρων
ῥπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάρων
ἄψος ὃς θάλλει κέαρ . . .

(There is no sound of bronze trumpets, nor is sweet sleep which warms the heart stolen in the morning from the eyes . . .)

The theme 'peace' is appropriate to the *παίαν* because it is associated with Apollo: so Pindar portrays Apollo as essentially a god of peace in *Pyth.* 1 and *Pyth.* 8.⁴

The first four lines of the epode describe Eniautos and the Horai approaching Thebes, bringing a sacrifice for Apollo; the last two lines are a closing prayer addressed to Apollo as 'Paian', asking him to protect the city. Perhaps Eniautos and the Horai were represented physically in a sacred procession, as they were in the Ptolemaic Soteria described by the Hellenistic historian Callixeinus. The Horai seem to have a double significance: on the one hand, characterized in a Hesiodic fashion as daughters of Themis (*The.* 901 ff.), they are linked to the idea of political order (their Hesiodic names are Eunomia, Dike, and Eirene), and they continue the theme of peace and stability. On the other hand, the presence of Eniautos, which is unprecedented, suggests that they should be seen as literal 'seasons' of the year.⁵

Was there a special link between Apollo and the Horai? Hellenistic poets seem to have thought so: Callimachus pictures the Horai

² The interjection *ἦ ἦ* can be paralleled by Sim. *PMG* 519 fr. 78 col. i. 10, which may be *extra metrum*: see Rutherford (1990), 185.

³ Forssman (1966) argues that Pindar's imitation of this passage accounts for the Ionic dialect form of *ὀδυνῆρα* in line 1.

⁴ See pp. 172–3.
⁵ Callixeinus: *FHG* iii. 58 (Athen. 198A). Horai and peace: see also Pind. *Ol.* 13. 6 ff. There may be an echo of the name of one of the Horai—Eunomia—in the last line of D1. Horai and harvest: D. Parrish, *LIMC* i. 799 ff. s.v. *Annus*; Hanfmann (1951), i. 91, 251, collects later evidence.

making an appearance at the Karnea (*Hy.* 2. 81), and Lycophron calls Apollo *ῥήτης* (354); the Horai also appear in the fragmentary Erythraean *παίδν* to Apollo (line 13).⁶ What might the connection have been? Part of it may be Apollo's special connection with the sun (implied already in A1), which is naturally thought of as being in charge of the seasons. Many centuries later, we find writers supporting this link with the convenient fact that Apollo's Egyptian equivalent was the god Horus.⁷ Another aspect may be that Apolline festivals were in some places connected with the harvest: vegetable offerings were brought to the Delphic Theoxenia, and also to the Attic Thargelia (a *θάργηλος* was an offering of grain). Sources report that at the Attic Thargelia and Puanepsia offerings were made to 'Helios and the Horai', so that Apollo's relationship with the sun may be important here also.⁸

The context of performance is likely to be a festival of Apollo at Thebes, but its identity remains uncertain; the original editors suggested the Theban Daphnephoria, but that was enneateric, whereas the reference to the year here points to a yearly festival.⁹ The epithet *παντελής* applied to Eniautos suggests that the festival happens at the end of one calendar year and the beginning of the next.¹⁰ This hypothesis would work nicely if the calendar year started in the summer, as in Attica, since the mood of the song seems to suit the lazy period after the harvest, but what evidence we have indicates that the calendar year in Boeotia started at the winter solstice.¹¹ Still, perhaps the reference here is to the conclusion of the agricultural cycle in the early summer, which for the purposes of poetry and cult might have taken precedence over the conventional chronological framework imposed by the calendar.

⁶ *ῥομέδων* at *IG* xii/5. 893 (Tenos). For linkage between Apollo and the Horai see also Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (1936), 228, on *HH Ap.* 194; Hanfmann (1951), i. 83, 91.

⁷ Apollo and the sun: p. 198; Danka (1971). Neoplatonist views: Macr. *Sat.* 1. 21. 13; Julian, *Εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἥλιον*, 11 (4). 147–8; V. Machaira, *LIMC* v. 502 ff., s.v. *Horai*; L. A. Casal, *LIMC* v. 510–11, s.v. *Horae*.

⁸ Theoxenia: p. 310; Attic Thargelia: *θάργηλος* in Hesych. ii. 300–1 Schmidt; Phot. *Lex.* 273 Naber. Offerings to Helios and Horai at Thargelia and Puanepsia: ΣAr. *Kn.* 729 (p. 175 Koster); perhaps also Porph. *Abst.* 2. 7; cf. Deubner (1932), 190–1.

⁹ GH 82; Wilamowitz (1922), 186–7; Stefos (1975), 192; for the Theban Daphnephoria see p. 201.

¹⁰ Wilamowitz (1922), 187, saw an allusion to a folk etymology of *ἐνιαυτός* as that which contains everything *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*, attested in Eur. *TGF* 862; Plut. *Def. or.* 416 A. But the epithet *παντελής* is motivated even without this allusion.

¹¹ Plut. *Pelopidas*, 24. 1; Samuel (1972), 67.

While D1 may have been a typical cult song, celebrating the deity and perhaps a hero with a colourful mythological narrative, it may in addition have celebrated a military victory within the context of a festival (compare the following song). This would suit the reference to peace in the final section, which could stand in contrast to a description of the struggle of battle earlier on in the song. As a parallel for this structure from a neighbouring culture, I would adduce the victory stele of the Egyptian pharaoh Merneptah (1199 BC), which, after celebrating Egyptian military victories, concludes with an elaborate description of the blessings of peace.¹²

D2 (Pa. II)

str. A [⌘] *Ναῖδ]ος Θρονίας Ἀβδηρε χαλκοθώραξ*

[Ἀβδηρίταις] *Ποσ]ειδᾶνός τε παῖ,*

σέθ]εν Ἰάονι τόνδε λαῶ

παι]άνα [δι]ώξω

5 *Δη]ρηνόν Ἀπόλλωνα πάρ τ' Ἀφρο[δίταν ∪-*

(lines 6-22 = str. A 5b-7 + ant. A missing)

col. 3 ep. A --- ∪ ∪ --- ∪ κᾶ[-

∪]ᾶ τινα [τάνδε] ναίω

⋮ ἰς χ *Θ[ρ]αῖκίαν γ[αῖ]αν ἀμπελό[εσ]σάν τε καὶ*

26 *εὐκαρπον· μή μοι μέγας ἔρπων*

κάμοι ἔξοπίσω χρόνος ἔμπεδος.

νεόπολῖς εἰμι· ματρὸς

δὲ ματέρ' ἑμᾶς ἔτεκον ἔμπαν

30 *πολεμῖν πυρὶ πλαγῇ-*

χ *σαν. εἰ δέ τις ἀρκέων φίλοις*

ἔχθροῖσι τραχὺς ὑπαντιάζει,

μόχθος ἡσυχίαν φέρει

¹² Lichtheim (1980) ii. 76-7: 'O how sweet it is to sit and babble! | One walks free-striding on the road, | for there's no fear in people's hearts; | fortresses are left to themselves, | wells are open for messengers' use. | Bastioned ramparts are becalmed, | sunlight only wakes the watchmen . . . The cattle of the field are left to roam, | no herdsmen cross the river's flood; | there's no calling out at night: | "Wait, I come", in a stranger's voice. | Going and coming are with song, | people don't (lament) and mourn; | towns are settled once again, | he who tends the crop will eat it.'

- 34 καιρῷ καταβαίνων.
 col. 4 ⁵⁻¹¹ ἡ ἰὲ Παιάν, ἡ ἰέ· Παιάν
 δὲ μήποτε λείπῃσι.
- str. B - - - - -] ἀλκαὶ δὲ τείχος ἀνδρῶν
 - - - - -] αἰ
 - - - - -] ρα· μάρναμαι μὰν
- 40 - - - - - δάοις
 - - - Ποσ]ειδάνιο[ν γ]ένος [
 τῶν γὰρ ἀντομένων
 - - - - -] φέρεσθαι
 - - - - -] ὡς ἑκάς
- 45 - - - πο]τικύρση
 - - - κα]ὶ μανίει
 [] - - - - -]
- ant. B - - - - - - - λ]αὸν ἀστῶν
 - - - - -]
- 50 - - - - -] οἰ· τὸ δ' εὖβου-
 col. 5 λία τε καὶ α[ἰδ]οῖ
 ἐγκείμενο[ν] αἰεὶ θάλλει μαλακαῖς ε[ὐ]δίαι[ς·]
 καὶ τὸ μὲν διδότη
 θεός· [ὁ δ'] ἐχθρὰ νοήσας
 55 ἤδη φθόνος οἷχεται
 τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων·
 χρὴ δ' ἄνδρα τοκεῦσι<ν> φέρειν
 — βαθύδοξον αἶσαν.
- ep. B τοὶ σὺν πολέμῳ κτησάμ[ενοι]
 60 χθόνα πολύδωρον, ὅλ[βον]
 ἐγκατέθηκαν πέραν Ἀ[θόω] Παιόνων
 αἰχματᾶν [λαοὺς ἐλάσαντε]ς
 3 ζαθέας τροφοῦ· ἀλλὰ [βαρεῖα μὲν]
 ἐπέπεσε μοῖρα· τλάντ[ω]ν
- 65 δ' ἔπειτα θεοὶ συνετέλεσσα[ν].
 col. 6 ὁ δὲ καλόν τι πονή[σ]αις
 εὐαγορίαισι φλέγει·
 κείνοις δ' ὑπέρτατον ἦλθε φέγγος
 ἅντα δ[υ]σμενέων Μελαμ-

- 70 φύλλου προπάροιθεν.
 5. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.
- str. c ἀ]λλά μιν ποταμῷ σχεδὸν μολόντα φύρσεν
 βαιοῖς σὺν ἔντεσιν
 75 ποτὶ πολὺν στρατόν· ἐν δὲ μηνὸς
 πρῶτον τύχεν ἄμαρ·
 ἄγγελλε δὲ φοινικόπεζα λόγον παρθένος
 εὐμένης Ἑκάτα
 τὸν ἐθέλοντα γενέσθαι.
 80 ν]ὺν δ' αὖ γ[λ]υκυμάχανον
 (lines 81–94 = str. c 7–9 + ant. c missing, with the
 possible exception of one line-end]ον preserved in fr. 5)
 ep. c 95 [---
 col. 8 . . .]ε καλέοντι μολπαῖ
 Δάλο]ν ἀν' εὐοδμον ἀμφί τε Παρ[νασ]σίαις
 πέτραις ὑψηλαῖς θαμὰ Δ[ελφ]ῶν
 λιπαρ]άμπυ[κε]ς ἰστάμεναι χορὸν
 100 ταχύ]ποδα π[αρ]θένοι χαλ-
 κέα]κελαδ[έον]τι γλυκὺν αὐδᾶ
 τρόπ]ον· ἐμοῖ[. . .].[.]ν ἔσ[]
 ≡ ε]ὐκλέα [- -]ν χά[ρ]ιν,
 Ἀβδ]ηρε, καὶ στ[ρατόν] ἱπποχάρμαν
 105 σᾶ] βίᾳ πολέ[μ]ῳ τελευ-
 ταί]ῳ προβι[β]άζοις.
 [5. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

Π⁴ cols. 1–8; Snell suggested that Π²* 3 (Π⁷ fr. 10 + a new fragment)]οὔτε βί[|]μεδοντ[|]ε ναίω[may belong in 23–5, if a variation in colometry is allowed. Z11–12 (Π⁷ fr. 84) may belong to D2. 108–D3. 1, unless it contributes to S2.

1 Bury ap. GH 4 [ἀνα]μῖξω GH 5 Δη]ρήνον Π (i.e. Δη]ρηνόν): Δη]ραῖνον Σ Lys. 440 (161. 26 Scheer) at line-end μολών Sitzler (1911b); ἰών Turyn 23 θαρ- σέοισα Sn on the basis of Σ 23–4 οὔ]τε or οὐδ]᾽ ἐ κα[κί/-]ο]νά τινα Sn (i.e. 'no worse than Teos') 25 Θρη]κίαν Diehl (1917) (cf. *Pyth.* 4. 205) 29 Π: ἔπιδον GH; ἔταφον von Arnim (1909); ἔρεφον D. S. Robertson (1927) 32 -άξει Π⁷ 37 ὕβρις ἄστε' ὄλεσσ] Jurenka (1912) ΑΛΚΑ]Ι Π (according to GH); -κᾶ Theon (Σ) 38 ὕψιστον ἴστατ]αι Bury ap. GH 40 δάοις from Σ 41 [ἴππων Bury ap. GH 44 Sn:], σέ]λας GH 46 κα]ῖ Sn]ιμάν] ἔει Radt 52 αἰεῖ Π⁷: αἰεῖ

Π¹ and Σ 56 *θανέντων* Π^{4c} 57 *τοκεῦσι* Π 59–62 von Arnim (1909)
 60–1 δ[λβω] | ἐν Irigoin (1952) 61 ἐγ- Π², perhaps attributed to Aristodemus;
 ἐν Π¹ (?) Ἀ[θόω] von Arnim (1909) from Σ: ἀ[γρίων] GH 63 Jurenka (1912)
 (βαρεία), von Arnim (1909) (μείν): ἀλλὰ [δυσώνυμος Housman (1908); ἀλλα [δ' ἄγοισά
 τοι GH; ἀλλα [δὲ μωμένα Wil (1913) 67 -CI Π^{4c}; -CIN Π^{4c} 73 *μολαντ*. Π^{4c}
φύρσει Fraccaroli (1909); *φύρσει* Π⁴ 74 *βαιός* Wil (1913) 75 ἐν Π¹, attributed
 to Nicander in Π²: ἐν Σ; ἐν GH 77 ἄγγειλε Leo in Wil (1922) 80 νῦν von
 Arnim (1909): σὺν GH *γλυκυμάχανοι* sc. ὕμνον (Sn) or χρησμών (Page) 95–
 6 σὲ δ' ἐκά- |βολ]ε Jurenka (1912); περ[ι-|κλυτ]ε Sn 97 Housman (1908); *νάσο*]ν
 Wil; *Κίρρα*]ν Gildersleeve (1909) (cf. Gildersleeve (1908)); *Πτῶσο*]ν Sitzler (1911b)
 98 ὕψαλ- Π^{4c} 99 Sn 100 ΧΑ[]Α Sn 101]Κ or]Χ 102 *τρόπ*]ον Sn,
κόσμο]ον Rutherford δὲ ἐκὼν ἐσ-|λῶν Bury ap. GH, δ' ἐπέων Sn 103 *πράξο*]ν
 von Arnim (1909); *πέμφο*]ν Turyn; *κραίνω*]ν Bury ap. GH; *τεῖσο*]ν Jurenka (1912)
 104 GH: *δαφν*]ηρέ Radt 105 Bury ap. GH: *εὐ*]δίᾳ Fraccaroli (1909); *οὐρίᾳ* Blass
 ap. GH

Σ 1 (Σ^{δ1}) *θώρακος*

2 (Σ^{δ1}) *πατρίον*

3a (Σ^{ε1}) ἀπὸ σοῦ τ(ήν) ἀρχήν λαβὼν οἶον ἀπ[< 13]

3b (Σ^{ε1}) ἄποικοι γάρ εἰσιν οἱ Ἀβδηρίται [Τηίων, Τέως] | δ' ἐστὶ τῆς Ἰωνίας
 πόλις η[< 15]

5 (Σ^{ε1}) τόπος ἐν Ἀ[βδηρίοις οὕτω καλού]μενος [δ]που[< 15?]

12 (Σ^{ε1}?) [< 17 Ἀβδη]ροις | [< 35] | [< 35] | [< 35]

23 (Σ^ε) θαρροῦσαν ω[< 15] | [.] .ν. [. . .] .ε[

25 (left margin) ·1· (i.e. 900)

27 (Σ^{δ1}) ἐλ[< 18]

29 (Σ^{ε1}) τὴν Τέω[λέγει ἦν ἐμπρησθεῖσαν ὑπὸ (τῶν)] | Περσῶν ἦν[κα < 20
 ἀν-]|έκτισαν οἱ Ἀ[βδηρίται < 10]

31 (Σ^{ε1}) εἰάν ἐν καιρῷ < 15] | κ(αι) τοὺς πολ[εμίους < 15]

32 (Σ^{ε2}) δύναται ὁ μόχθος < 15] | εἰς τὸν λο[ιπὸν χρόνον < 10] | ἔρ-
 ρει

34 (Σ^{ε2}) δύναται ὁ μόχθος ![< 15]

37a (Σ^{ε2}) [δύ]νεται ἡ τ(ῶν) [ἀνδ]ρῶν ὠφέλεια ἢ ὁ αὐχοῦσιν ἢ τὸ λῆμμα.

37b (Σ^{δ2}) ἀλ)κᾶ Θέω(ν)· ὅμοιον τῷ πότε|ρον δίκᾳ τεῖχος ὕψιστον ἦ
 σκo|λιαῖς ἀπάταις (Pind. fr. 213. 1–2)

40 (Σ^{δ2}) δαίοις

41 (Σ^{ε1}) τὸ νόημα τοιοῦτο· ἐν οἷς γὰρ διαφέρειν δοκοῦσιν οἱ ἀντίπαλοι κατὰ
 πόλεμον, ταῦτα ἐκποιεῖν ἀγαθὰς ὑποτίθεται νίκης ἐλπίδας, (Σ^{ε2}) ἢ ἡ ἵππος εὐ-
 θετεῖ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀντιπάλων παντοδαπὴν ἔφοδον, οἶον εἰάν τε πεζεύωσιν εἰάν τε
 μεθ' ἵππων παρατυγχάνωσιν, τρεψόμεθα αὐτοὺς τῷ ἵππικῳ.

46 (Σ^{ε2}) φθονεῖ

48 (Σ^{ε2}) εἶη (ἄν) ὑβρίσῃ τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει στασιαζόντας τε καὶ πολιτε[ύ]οντας
 πολλῶ μάλλον τοὺς ἐπήλυδας ἐπιτίθε(σθαι) ἢ ὀξέως;

52 (Σ^{ε1}) αἰεῖ

55 (Σ^{ε2}) οἶον οὐκέτι δ[εῖ ἡμᾶ]ς φθονεῖσθαι | τ(ῶν) γονέων ἡμ[ῶν τ(ῶν) πρ]ο-
 θαγόντων ἀλλ' οὐ|δὲ καὶ ἀνδρ[εῖ]ας· ἔθανον χάρ.

57 (Σ^{ε2}) δεῖ [τοῖς ᾄ]θλοῖς) τῇ[s] ἀνδρείας ἐνμογήσαι | [<9] νῆιν προ[δ]s
τοῦ(s) μέλ[λο]ντα(s) πολέμους εἰ γένοιτο.

61 (Σ^{δ1} over text) ἐγ- Ἀρ(ιστόδημος)

63 (Σ^{ε1}) [<5] π[ε]ρ [τὸ]ν Ἄθω ἐκβληθέντες | οἱ ἐνοικο[ῦ]ντ[ε]s ἐπῆλ-
θον | ᾀ]μνου[μ]νοι τοῦs ἐκβαλόν-|τας καὶ ἐν[ι]κ[η]σαν

65a [<10] .

65b (Σ^ε) (under column) ὑπομεινάν[των <12] | οἱ θεοὶ τελο[<15]

70 (Σ^{ε1}) τόπος οὗ(τος) ἐν Ἀβδήροις | M[ε]λ[λ]άμφυλλον

73a π. [<15] | ο. [<15]

73b (Σ^{ε1}) δύναται φύρσει ἀποκτενεῖ[<15] | ὁ ἡμέτερος στρατὸς τ(ὼν)
γονέ[ων <15]

75a (over ἐν in the text) Νι(κάνωρ)

75b (Σ^{ε1}) (in margin) ἐν δέ

77 (Σ^{ε2}) προέλεγεν τ(ὴν) μέλλ[<15] | τοῖς ἡμετέροις

79 (Σ^{ε1}) ἀν(τὶ τοῦ) ὄν ἥθελεν γενέσθαι[<15]

81-95]ολε[.] |]ται | | (Σ^δ)]ε Ἀβδ[η]ρ

102 (Σ^{ε1}) τ(ὴν) ᾤδῃν

105 (Σ^{ε1}) οὗτος καὶ ο[<5]

106 (Σ^δ) ἴσως τῇ ν[ι]κῇ ~1]

29 D'Alessio (1992a): τὴν τεκ[οῦσαν πόλιν GH 37a λῆμα Diehl (1917)

37b The MS text of the fragment has δίκη and ὕμιον 48 <μῆ> εἶη von Arnim

(1909) (ἀν) transposed by Waś: ἀν ἡ ὀξέως (at end of scholium) Π τε GH; δέ Π

πολιτεύοντας: (δια)πολιτεύοντας GH μάλλον <ῆ> τοὺς ἐπῆλυδας GH (transposing <ῆ>

from end of scholium) ἐπιτίθ(εσθαι): ἐντίθ(εσθαι) D'Alessio (1992a) 61 suppl.

McNamee (1977); Ἀρ(ιστόνικος) McNamee (1981) 75a McNamee (1977): others

read Ἀρ(ιστοφάνης); see Slater (1986), fr. 384B 75b ἐν (= ἐόν) GH

TRIAD A. [MARGINAL TITLE: *For the Abderites*] Abderus, with breastplate of bronze, son of the Naiad Thronia and of Poseidon! I shall drive this paeon for the Ionian people from you to Apollo Derenus and Aphrodite . . . I dwell in this Thracian land, rich in vines and fertile in fruits. May great time as it creeps on not tire in the future in its steady course for me. I am of a new city, but I have given birth to my mother's mother when she was stricken by enemy fire. But if any man in aiding his friends resists his enemies fiercely, toil brings peace, reaching its goal at the right moment. *Ie ie* Paian, *ie ie*. May Paian never fail.

TRIAD B. . . . valiant acts are the [highest (?)] wall of men . . . I fight . . . with the . . . enemy . . . the race of Poseidon . . . For those engaging . . . to be carried . . . far . . . he meets . . . and bears a grudge . . . people of the citizens . . . Something planted in good counsel and respect always blooms in soft good weather. Let god grant this. But envy with hostile mind for those who died long ago has now perished. A man must give his ancestors their due share in profound glory. Through war they acquired land that yields great gifts, and stored up wealth beyond Mount Athos [driving away the race] of the Paenionian spearmen from their holy mother. A heavy fate fell

upon them, but later, after they endured, the gods joined them in fulfilling their aims. A man who achieves something noble blazes with shouts of good omen. For those men the highest light came against their enemies in front of Mount Melamphyllon. *Ie ie Paian, ie ie*. May Paian never fail.

TRIAD C. But he defiled him as he came near the river with few weapons to fight a great army. It was the first day of the month. The virgin with the red border, kindly Hecate, was the messenger for the word which wanted to come true. But now with sweet art . . . The songs call (him) throughout fragrant Delos and around the high rocks of Parnassus the virgins of Delphi with bright headbands often set up a swift-footed chorus and sweetly sing with bronze voice. But for me . . . the glorious . . . grace . . . Abderus, and may you advance the army delighting in horses with your strength for the final war. *Ie ie Paian, ie ie*. May Paian never fail.

(1) Breastplate. (2) Patrios. (3a) Taking a beginning from you . . . (3b) The Abderites are colonists of the Teians, and Teos is a city in Ionia . . . (5) A place in Abdera so called where . . . (12) At Abdera. (23) Bold . . . (?). (29) He means Teos [which, being burnt by the Persians] when . . . the Abderites founded . . . (31) At the right point . . . and the enemy (32) *ὁ μόχθος* means . . . with respect to the future . . . is gone. (34) *ὁ μόχθος* means . . . (37a) It means 'assistance of men' or 'what they boast of' or 'advantage'. (37b) Theon: *ἀλκῆ*. It is like: 'whether justice is the highest wall, or whether it is through crooked deceit' [Pind. fr. 213. 1-2]. (40) To the hostile ones. (41) The thought is: 'Working at the things in which the enemy seems to be superior in war lays down good hopes for victory', or: 'The cavalry is good against any form of attack by the enemy, e.g. whether they are on foot or whether they attack with horses, we will turn them back with the cavalry.' (46) Is envious. (47) Examples of hubris would be when people engage in factions in the city and when the citizens indulge in greatly increased or fierce attacks on new residents. (52) Always. (55) For example, it is no longer necessary for us to be envied for our parents who died before us, not even for their bravery; for they died. (57) It is necessary to work at the prizes of bravery . . . for future wars, if they happen. (60) *εὔ-* Ar(istodemus) (63) Driven out beyond Athos the inhabitants attacked, defending themselves against those who had driven them out, and they won a victory. (65b) If they endure . . . the gods. (70) This place Melamphyllon is in the area of Abdera. (73b) *φύρσει* means 'The army of our parents will kill.' (75a) Nicanor. (75b) And one. (77) She foretold the future . . . | to our men. (79) Instead of 'which she wanted to happen'. (102) The song. (105) And this one. (106) Perhaps through victory.

There was a mythological tradition that Abdera was founded by the hero Abderus.¹ The first historical colonization was by the Clazomenians under Timesias in 654 or 652 BC,² but the colony failed, although Timesias was honoured as a hero at Abdera in the

¹ Ps.-Skymnos, *Perieg.* 667 ff. (= *GGM* i. 222); Jurenka (1912), 172 ff., speculated that since Abderus was supposed to come from Thronion in Locris (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 5. 8 calls him a Locrian and his mother Thronia is connected with Thronion: D schol. on Hom. *Il.* 2. 533), this might reflect a mythological tradition that Abdera was colonized from Thronion.

² First colonization: Her. 1. 168; Euseb. *Chron.* ii. 86-7 Schoene. Second colonization: Her. 1. 168; Strabo 14. 1. 30. The return: Her. 6. 8. 1.

time of Herodotus. The Teians colonized it again when after the attack of Harpagos (545 BC) they abandoned their home country, like the Phocaeans. Some of the Teians subsequently returned to Teos—the interval is uncertain, but it must have happened by the time of the battle of Lade (496 BC), when the Teians contributed seventeen ships to the Ionian fleet. The Abderites probably had a less troubled relationship with Persia: they may have had to come to terms with the Persians when Megabazos took Thrace in 514 BC, and when Xerxes returned to Abdera after the battle of Salamis Herodotus seems to imply that he established some sort of political relationship with the city.³ Abdera joined the Delian League after Cimon's expedition, and to judge from the tribute it was richer than any other Thracian state with the exception of Thasos. In 408 BC it is reported to have been one of the most powerful cities in Thrace.⁴ Abdera's major adversary throughout her history was the indigenous population of Thrace: this is a major theme in D2; earlier problems with Thrace can be inferred from the failure of Timesias' colony; we hear of a serious defeat of Abdera by the Thracians in 376 BC.⁵

Of the three triads of D2, the central sections of the first and third are missing. The plan of the whole may have been something like this:

| | | |
|---------|-------------|--|
| TRIAD A | Strophe | Introduction |
| | Antistrophe | Story of Abderus? self-description by <i>χορός</i> ? |
| | Epode | Self-description as citizens of Abdera |
| TRIAD B | Strophe | Defence of Abdera |
| | Antistrophe | Transition: reflections on politics |
| | Epode | Battle of Mount Melamphyllon |
| TRIAD C | Strophe | Prophecy of Hecate |
| | Antistrophe | Power of song/prophecy? |
| | Epode | Concluding prayer |

New triads start with a new thought, and the effect is particularly abrupt because of the refrain. Only one inter-stanzaic division survives (the epode of the second triad, line 59), and that also coincides

³ Arrangement with Megabazos: Her. 5. 2. Xerxes: Her. 8. 120. Garrisons: Diod. 11. 44; Plut. *Cimon*, 7.

⁴ Delian League: Radt (1958), 15 n. 2. Powerful in 408 BC: Diod. 13. 72. 2.

⁵ Earlier conflict: Strabo 10. 2. 17; 12. 3. 20 says that the Saioi to whom Archil. (*IEG* 5. 1) is supposed to have lost his shield lived in the area near Abdera. Later conflict: Diod. 15. 36. 1 ff.; Aen. Tact. 15. 8–10.

with the start of a new sentence, so there is a chance that all antistrophes and epodes began with new sentences. It is a peculiarity of the song that, instead of the myth section that we find in other *Paianes* and songs of other genres, it recounts a series of episodes from Abderite history. If there was a section of myth in one of the lacunae, it cannot have been very long. Thus, the song's subject is not so much religion as war: it commemorates and celebrates past military victories and it aims to galvanize the Abderites in the face of coming battles.⁶ Both functions are captured by the refrain, each occurrence of which comes at the climax of a description of military action. This is weakly implied at the end of the first triad, rather more strongly at the end of the second, which comes at the culmination of a description of Abderite military activities and the battle of Mount Melamphyllon (one is tempted to analyse the refrain as a victory *παίαν*), and strongly also at the end of the third, where it comes after a prayer for future military success (here it could be seen as a pre-battle *παίαν*).⁷

D₂ begins and probably ends with references to the Thracian hero Abderus (lines 1, 104).⁸ Abderus may have been invoked as a hero suitable for war: the adjective applied to him in the first line—*χαλκοθώραξ*—suggests that he has military importance.⁹ The creation of a cult of Abderus can perhaps be thought of as an attempt by the Abderites to ground their polis in the traditions of Greek mythology. The pre-Teian foundation by Timesias of Clazomenae is ignored (at least in the extant parts of the song), although he was worshipped as a hero there.¹⁰ According to the usual

⁶ Radt (1958), 19, discusses the genre only briefly. He believes that it is primarily a cult *παίαν*, since the 'παίαν before important undertakings', which would have been sung by everyone, would have had to be simple. He admits, however, that it may have been occasioned by specific circumstances, presumably the 'final war'.

⁷ Subtle use of the refrain in this song: Radt (1958), 16 and n. 1. For the idea that a single reference to a *παίαν* can have several levels of significance, see §11. The metre of the refrain consists of the same element (υ-υυ -) repeated three times, which may be significant in view of the tendency for the *παίαν*-cry to be uttered three times: see pp. 19 n. 8, 50, 79.

⁸ In line 104 Radt suggests the very rare and late *δαφν]ηρέ* (only in Michael Akominatos (12th cent.), 2. 14. 15 Lambros) on the grounds that *Ἀβδ]ηρέ* is too short a supplement, but tracing suggested to me that if anything *Ἀβδ]ηρέ* would be too long.

⁹ The epithet is used of Enualios at fr. 169a. 12 (interestingly, a context connected with Abdera) and at Soph. *Aj.* 179. Hampe (1941), 142, notes the military significance of Abderus.

¹⁰ For the cult of Timesias see Her. 1. 168. It is possible that honours were paid to

version of the saga, attested as early as Hellanicus, Abderus was the henchman of Heracles who was torn apart by the horses of the Thracian king Diomedes.¹¹ Since Aristophanes of Byzantium said that Pindar called the horses of Diomedes *πρόβατα*, Radt conjectured that the death of Abderus might have been related in a lost section of D2, perhaps in the first antistrophe.¹² A few years after Radt's publication, the song that Aristophanes of Byzantium was really referring to came to light in *POxy* 2450 (=Pind. fr. 169a). Of course, Pindar's having related a myth in one song does not reduce the probability that he might have related it in another also. What does count against Radt's hypothesis is the absence of any explicit reference to Abderus in fr. 169a, which makes it possible that he was not connected with Heracles' labour until the time of Hellanicus.¹³

Two other deities are mentioned in the proem. The first is Apollo Derenus, known only from Abdera. A scholion on Lycophron's *Alexandra*, 440, explains the name 'Derainos' as derived from a place called *Δήραινός*, which is said to be *ἐν Ἀβδήροις* ('in the area of Abdera'), which Raven suggests may have lain outside the city, rather like the temples of Apollo at Claros and Didyma (one thinks of de Polignac's 'bipolar' polis, with two cult centres, one in the polis and one outside).¹⁴ But it is also possible that Derenos/Derainos (or something like it) was the name of a local divinity who had undergone syncretism with Apollo (is his name also present in the name of Abdera?).¹⁵ Apollo's importance at Abdera is indepen-

Timesias and Abderus simultaneously, but it is also possible that the cult of Abderus displaced that of Timesias (both suggestions in Malkin (1987), 76, 204).

¹¹ Hellanikos, *FGrH* 4 F 104; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 5. 8. On iconography see *LIMC* s.v. *Abderus*.

¹² Radt (1958), 25, referring to Pind. fr. 316 (Ar. Byz. fr. 123 Slater (1986) = fr. 42 Nauck).

¹³ See Raven (1967), reviewing May (1966).

¹⁴ Raven (1967), 295; *ΣLyc.* 440 (161. 26 Scheer) *Δηραίνου κύνες· Δήραινός τόπος οὕτω καλούμενος ἐν Ἀβδήροις, ἔνθα Δηραίνου Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόν ἐστιν, οὗ μνημονεύει Πίνδαρος ἐν Παϊάσι* ('*Dogs of Derainos*: a place of that name in Abdera, where there is a temple of Apollo Derainos, which Pindar mentions in the *Paianes*'). The meaning of *ἐν Ἀβδήροις* is elucidated by the *Σ* on line 69 and by Her. 7. 126, cited below in n. 49. On Apollo Derainos in general see Isaac (1986), 106–7. The form 'Derainos' could be a deformation, suggesting a folk etymology from *δῆρις* and *αἰνός* (Radt (1958), 30).

¹⁵ Darrhon, a Macedonian healing deity, is mentioned in Hesych. i. 406 Latte. For syncretism in Greek colonization see Lévêque (1973). There could also be a connection with the tribe of the Derrones, believed on the basis of numismatic data from the 5th–4th cents. BC to have occupied the north part of the Strymon valley (near modern Stib) and to have been neighbours of the Paeonians: Head (1911),

dently attested on coins, some of which seem to represent a cult statue, probably that of Apollo Derenus.¹⁶ The cult of Aphrodite is not otherwise attested at Abdera (although a goddess portrayed on a coin has sometimes been identified with Aphrodite).¹⁷ Later on in the song a prophecy of Hecate is reported (line 78), and it is quite possible that she was mentioned also in the lacuna after line 5. There is independent evidence of a cult of Hecate at Abdera in the personal names of Abderite magistrates known from coins and also the name of the historian Hecataeus of Abdera (fourth century BC). Wilamowitz argued that Hecate of Abdera was identified with the local Thracian goddess Bendis, and was the same goddess as the Parthenos of Neapolis.¹⁸ Dionysus is likely to have been mentioned also, since numismatic evidence shows that he was the most important deity in the city in the fifth century BC.¹⁹

The speaking subject must be an Abderite (perhaps a member of an Abderite *χορός*): that is the only interpretation that makes sense of *μάρναμαι* in line 39, and the speaking subject is not likely to fluctuate within the song.²⁰ Prima facie, the opening lines indicate that the performers are processing 'from Abderus to Apollo Derenus and Aphrodite', i.e. from the shrine of one to the shrines of the others. Radt argues against procession, on the grounds that a triadic song should not be processional, but this is dubious reasoning. The expression *παί]ᾱνα [δὲ]ώξω* is a metaphor derived from chariot-driving, with the *παίᾱν* as the chariot, and although it need

201-2; von Blumenthal (1942), 2344; Hammond and Griffith (1979), 75-6. The *Δερσαῖοι* of Her. 7. 110 and the *Δερραῖοι* of Steph. Byz. 226. 6 Meineke are perhaps the same.

¹⁶ May's nos. 349-50, 449-53. The suggestion was first made by K. O. Müller, *History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*, trans. H. Turfnell (2 vols.; London, 1830), i. 253, cited by Raven (1967), 295; also Isaac (1986), 107.

¹⁷ Isaac (1986), 107; see Raven (1967), 294, criticizing May for not accepting Strack's identification of the heads on May's 316 and 200 with Aphrodite.

¹⁸ 'Hekat-' (May's group xxv from his period II = 520/15-492), Hekataios (May's group lxxxviii from period V = 439/7-411/10), and Hekatonymus (May's group cxxxiv from May's period IX = c.365/60-350/45); Wilamowitz (1913), 251; Isaac (1986), 107-8. On Bendis see G. Kazarow, *RE* s.v. *Thrake (Religion)*, xia. 505 ff.

¹⁹ Isaac (1986), 82-5; Raven (1967); Bilabel (1920), 200 ff.

²⁰ So Lefkowitz (1963); the point about consistency is made by von Arnim (1909). Others have supposed that it was the city that speaks in lines 28 ff., taking *νεόπολις* as a noun; Wilamowitz (1913), 248; Farnell (1930-2), i. 296; Bowra (1964), 364; Hamilton (1974), 114; LSJ s.v.

mean no more than 'sing', it seems to suggest the idea of singing while moving.²¹

It is another question in what direction the *χορός* are moving. The obvious starting-point would be Abdera itself, where we may reasonably locate the Heroon of Abderus in the place called Derainos, where there was a shrine of Apollo.²² Aphrodite's shrine will presumably have been in the vicinity. Perhaps they followed the Sacred Way at Abdera mentioned in the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, 3. 7. Their movement would be analogous to the procession of the Milesian *Μολποί* to the shrine of Apollo at Didyma. The presence of a guild of *Μολποί* in Abdera may be indicated by the occurrence on Abderite coins of magistrates' names with *Μολπ-* as the first element.²³

This line of argument suggests that the occasion of the song might have been a regularly occurring festival of Apollo, perhaps one in which the celebration of victory in a war against the Thracians had come to play a special part. But we should not rule out the possibility that this festival was primarily a commemoration of the victory, and was held in Apollo's shrine only because Apollo was deemed to have had a special role in bringing it about.²⁴

When the text resumes after the lacuna the *χορός* are describing their homeland: they say it is full of vines and fertile.²⁵ They pray that time will not become tired, and announce that they are a young

²¹ As in fr. 107a *Πελασγὸν ἵππον ἢ κύνα | Ἀμυκλαίαν ἀγωνίῳ | ἐλελιζόμενος ποδὶ μίμεο καμπύλον μέλος διώκων* . . . ('Imitate the Pelasgian horse or the bitch of Amyclae, whirling around with a competing foot, chasing a turning tune'). Real movement is not implied in *Isth.* 4. 3 *ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνῳ διώκων* ('pursuing your virtues in song'); or in Pratinas, *PMG* 712a *μήτε σύντονον δίκωκε | μήτε τὰν ἀνειμέναν | μούσαν* ('Do not pursue a muse that is intense, nor one that is relaxed').

²² So Wilamowitz (1913), 247; contrast Jurenka (1912), 209–10, who thought that the song was performed at Derainos, where he supposed the shrines of Apollo, Abderus, and Aphrodite were all located, but did not think of a procession. He also suggested that the occasion was the games in honour of Abderus supposed to have been instituted by Heracles (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 5. 8; Philostr. *Imag.* 2. 25, ii. 379 Kayser).

²³ For the Milesian *Μολποί* see p. 60. The Abderite names are Molpas (May's group LX, from his period IV=473/70–449/8) and Molpagoras (May's group C, from his period VI=411/10–386/5, and May's group CXIII, from his period VII=386/5–375). The importance of names beginning with the element *Μολπ-* has been stressed by Poland (1935), 510.

²⁴ For such festivals see p. 46.

²⁵ For this idea in encomium see Kienle (1936), 41, who points to the vine on Thracian coins (cf. Head (1911), 250), and such Thracian wines as *Ἰσμαρικὸς* (Archil. *IEG* 2. 2; Hom. *Od.* 9. 196 ff.) and *Μενδαῖος* (Philyllius, *PCG* vii, fr. 23; Hermippus, *PCG* v. 600 fr. 77. 1).

city. In lines 28 ff. the *χορός* seem to say that they gave birth to their mother's mother when she was burnt, and this is followed by a gnome: if one defends one's friends and confronts one's enemies, well-timed labour brings peace (the language suggests the proem of *Pythian* 8). The idea of giving birth to one's grandmother is so unusual that some have felt that the verb *ἔτεκον* has to be emended. But in fact the eccentricity of the expression merely reflects a highly abnormal event: the refoundation by a colony of its mother city.²⁶

Two possible historical interpretations have emerged:

1. GH suggested that the mother's mother is Athens, which according to one version was responsible for the foundation of Teos; the hypothesis of an Athenian context might give special point to the expression *Ἰάονι . . . λαῶν* in line 3.²⁷

2. Radt and Huxley argue that the mother's mother is Teos, the mother city of Abdera, from where Teos can be presumed to have been refounded after being destroyed or abandoned (compare Strabo's statement that some of the Teians returned after founding Abdera, though could this be based on a scholion to this song?).²⁸

Two points seem to decide it in favour of (2). First, cities are often addressed by poets as 'mother', so that 'mother's mother' would naturally refer to a mother city, in this case Teos.²⁹ Secondly, we now know from a new fragment of the Teian *Dirae* recently published by Hermann that the relationship between colony and mother city was in this case especially close (as one might expect if Teos was recolonized from Abdera), so that the intimacy implied in the expression 'I gave birth to my mother's mother' does not seem inappropriate to describe this bond.³⁰

The chronology is another matter. Teos was probably burnt at

²⁶ The obscurity of the expression may perhaps reflect the conventional obscurity of foundation oracles: so Dougherty (1992). Another level of meaning is explored by Stehle (1996), 130, who sees the lines as part of a pattern of appropriation of female identity by the *χορός* in this song.

²⁷ Strabo 14. 1. 3; Paus. 7. 3. 6; GH were followed by Bowra (1964), 142, and more recently by Robert and Robert (1976), 213 n. 238; Isaac (1986), 91 and n. 99). There was also another version according to which Athamas founded Teos (loc. cit., also Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F 102).

²⁸ Radt (1958); Huxley (1984).

²⁹ See Slater (1969a), s.v. 3c.; a particularly interesting case is *Ol.* 6. 84, though there is no implication of colonization: *ματρομάτωρ Στυμφαλῆς, εὐανθῆς Μετώπα, πλάξιππον ἃ Θῆβαν ἔτικτεν* ('Mother's mother Stymphalos, fragrant Metope, who bore horse-driving Thebe').

³⁰ P. Hermann (1981). The new fragment is *SEG* xxxi. 985 (see A. 6–7); for the old see *SEG* xxxi. 984. See now McCabe and Plunkett (1985), 262.

least twice: first when Harpagos attacked, and second after the battle of Lade. D2. 28–9 most probably refers to one of these, but it is difficult to decide which. The earlier date has been reasserted by Huxley, who thinks of a quick recolonization, on the grounds that Teian silver coins show a continuous series from the late sixth century BC to the early fifth.³¹ But D'Alessio has recently defended the later date with three main arguments: first, that the idea of 'giving birth to one's mother's mother' suits a considerable interval between the foundation of Abdera and the refoundation of Teos; second, that the song was probably composed after 490 BC (since very little of Pindar's *œuvre* can be dated before), and that a description in these terms of a refoundation of fifty years before would be unlikely in a song composed after 490 BC; and thirdly, that renewed Abderite involvement in Teos after the battle of Lade might explain why of the two fragments of the Teian *Dirae*, both probably from the first half of the fifth century BC, the one mentions Abdera, while the other does not. None of these points is conclusive, but, taking them together, I would agree with D'Alessio that they support the later dating.³²

For the first half of the second triad we have only the right margin of the text. The thought can be to some extent made out from the scholia, which are especially frequent in this section, though difficult. The subject of the strophe seems to be present and future combat. It started with a gnome, of which the second half survives: 'and valiant acts are the highest (?) wall of men'.³³ Then we have a verb in the present tense—'I am fighting'—and a reference to 'the race of Poseidon', which this time must mean horses (not Abderus).³⁴ Around line 43 the sense must have been something like 'We will match the enemy however they attack', since that is the only way of accounting for the two alternative interpretations pro-

³¹ Balcer (1968), 9–10. Huxley (1984) also thinks that he can infer from Her. 1. 168 that some of the Teians must have returned as well, since some of the Phocaeans did (Her. 1. 165. 3), and Herodotus implies that Phocaeans and Teians behaved in the same way; but there is no need to assume that the two groups behaved in exactly the same way. One quibble with Huxley: he thinks that even if the refoundation is early, the fire referred to in lines 28–31 could be that following the battle of Lade, but the poem clearly implies that the fire preceded the refoundation.

³² D'Alessio (1992a).

³³ There is another example of ἀλκαί in the sense of 'valiant actions' at *Nem.* 7. 12.

³⁴ For Thracian cavalry see Best (1969), 13 n. 74; Isaac (1986), 85–6, on this part of the song.

posed by the scholiast: either 'to work at things in which the enemy seem to excel in war lays down good hopes for victory' or 'horses are useful against any form of attack by the enemy, i.e. we will rout them with cavalry whether they attack on foot or with horses'.

The antistrophe seems to have started with a contrast between a bad and a good political situation, which provides a transition to the description of the battle in the epode. The description of the bad political situation is lost, though it is reflected in a difficult scholion on line 48, which mentions faction and 'newcomers' (ἐπήλυδας)—probably a second wave of Teians.³⁵ The description of the desirable political situation survives (50–4): 'Something planted in good counsel and respect always blooms in soft good weather'; and both political situations are summarized in 54–5: 'Let god grant this. But envy with hostile mind for those who died long ago has now perished.' The reflection on envy seems to serve a double function: (1) it refers to the bad political situation in the past (in which case the envy is that felt by different groups of ancestors for each other), and (2) it serves as a foil for the following exhortation to praise (in which case it is the envy of present and future generations for their ancestors).³⁶

The epode describes the accomplishments of the ancestors in three stages: (1) success beyond Athos (59–63); (2) a set-back (63–4, including τλάντων); and (3) another success at Mount Melamphylon. What is interesting is that, as far as we can see, this section of recent history has (as it were) replaced the section of myth that we find in *Epinikia* and *Paianes*.

1. *Success beyond Athos* (59–63). Early interpreters took this as referring to the abortive colonization attempt of Timesias of Klazomenae, but Radt asserted that τοκεῦσι in line 57 implies a more recent stage.³⁷ Pindar seems to say that the Paeonians were driven beyond Mount Athos. This raises a problem, in so far as the Paeonians seem to have lived to the west, in the neighbourhood of the Strymon,³⁸ whereas the Abderites are more likely to have encoun-

³⁵ D'Alessio (1992a) has argued that this is the case, reading ἐντίθε(σθαι), which he compares with the use of θερός in *SEG* xxxi. 985, A 6–7 (see n. 30).

³⁶ (1): von Arnim (1909), 14; (2) in Radt (1958), 53 ff., who takes τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων as a genitive absolute, with προθανόντων as the predicate. Pindar may intend both at once: neither (1) nor (2) requires that τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων is a genitive absolute; in (2) it is an objective genitive, and in (1) it could be simultaneously objective and subjective, ἀπὸ κοινοῦ (for such constructions see Des Places (1962)).

³⁷ GH 17; von Arnim (1909), 15 ff.

³⁸ Isaac (1986), 86.

tered the Saioi (to whom Archilochus lost his shield), and the Sinties and Sepaioi, mentioned by Strabo as having resided in the region of Abdera.³⁹ It may be that the Paeonians were more widely diffused than we think—after all, Herodotus (5. 1) reports that the Perinthians and the Paeonians once fought a battle, which would put the Paeonians much further over towards the east. On the other hand, it is also possible that Pindar is using the name *Παιόνων* imprecisely—perhaps, like Herodotus or his source, he was struck by the similarity of the name of the tribe to the Greek battle-cry *ἰὴ παιάν*.⁴⁰

2. *A set-back* (63–4). Presumably this was a Thracian attack of some sort. We have no evidence that the colonists were ever driven out of Thrace. I think the set-back is referred to in *τλάντ[ω]*ν in the next sentence also.⁴¹

3. *The battle of Mount Melamphyllon*. After the set-back, the gods subsequently (*ἔπειτα*) joined in the accomplishment. This is followed by a gnome: someone who achieves something noble blazes with shouts of good omen (*εὐαγορίαις*), which presumably means *παιάν*-cries of victory. The victory itself is described in terms of light,⁴² which echoes the metaphor just used for praise in the gnome, and is offset by the name of the place of battle, Melamphyllon ('Black-leaves'), which Pliny the Elder identifies as a mountain.⁴³ The description of the battle is rounded off with the second *παιάν*

³⁹ Archil. *IEG* 5. 1; Strabo 10. 2. 17; 12. 3. 20; 14. 1. 30; Anacr. *PMG* 504 = ΣHom. *Od.* 8. 294 (i. 383. 4 Dindorf); *Suda* s.v. *Ἀνακρέων* (i. 172. 2 Adler); Malkin (1987), 55; Isaac (1986), 86.

⁴⁰ For Herodotus' narrative see pp. 43–4, 116, with Asheri (1990). An alternative would be to take the *Παιόνων* as part of a phrase qualifying Athos, e.g. *πέραν Ἀ[θήω] Παιόνων | αἰχματάν [ἐχθροὺς ἐλάσαντε]ς | ζαθέας τροφού* ('driving the enemy beyond Athos, the sacred mother of the Paionian warriors'), but the word-order here is awkward, and I can see no other way of solving the problem.

⁴¹ Radt (1958) thinks that *τλάντ[ω]*ν means 'being bold' rather than 'suffering', on the grounds that this is the only way to make sense of *συνετέλεσσα[ν]*. But the prefix implies that the gods helped in conjunction with efforts that are implied to have been made by the soldiers themselves.

⁴² Hampe (1941) argued that the sense of *φέγγος* must be 'salvation', but Radt (1958), 61, and following him D. Bremer (1976), 281, argue for the sense 'victory/resulting fame', comparing other passages where metaphors involving light are used of fame, e.g. *Ol.* 1. 23, 97 ff.; *Nem.* 3. 83–4; *Nem.* 9. 40–1.

⁴³ *NH* 4. 11. 50; Pliny uses the masculine form *Melamphyllus*, while Σ Π⁴ makes it neuter. Notice *μελαμφυλ[λ] in Sim. PMG* 519 fr. 93. 3. For the contrast between the name 'Melamphyllon' and the image of light in the previous lines see Norwood (1956), 93.

refrain, which is almost certainly meant to suggest a victory *παιάν* (as explained earlier).

The third triad begins abruptly with a difficult sentence which is usually read as the content of the prophecy concerning the battle delivered by Hecate and referred to in lines 78–9.⁴⁴ The close association between Hecate and Apollo's sister Artemis makes a reference to her in a *παιάν* especially appropriate.⁴⁵ Radt took her prophecy to refer to a future victory, presumably the 'last victory' referred to at the very end of the song. He supports this with the argument that the imperfect tense of ἄγγελλε implies that the oracle of Hecate made a prophecy which still concerns the Abderites.⁴⁶ However, it seems to me just as likely that the imperfect tense conveys the continuing concern that the Abderites had with the prophecy from the point when it was given up to the time of the battle, which could still be in the past.⁴⁷ In that case, it is more likely that the prophecy refers to the battle of Mount Melamphyllon.⁴⁸

The transmitted text for the first two lines of the third triad would have to mean 'But he (she, it?) will defile him (the enemy?) as he comes near the river with few weapons against a great army.' The river may be the Nestos, an important river in the area of Abdera.⁴⁹ The absence of a subject in the sentence is the central problem. Wilamowitz suggested emending *βαιοῖς* to *βαιός* ('a small man/few men'), but the small improvement in sense is insufficient to justify the change.⁵⁰ Others have suggested understanding a specific

⁴⁴ Prophecy and battle: Pritchett (1971–91), iii. 47 ff.

⁴⁵ For Hecate and Artemis see Kraus (1960), 12 ff., comparing the *παιάν* sung in honour of Hecate in the *Μολποί* inscription, 25 and 28. For the epithet *φουνικόπεζα*, only here of Hecate (of Demeter at *Ol.* 6. 94), see Wunderlich (1925), 93 ff.; Stulz (1990), 14.

⁴⁶ See Radt (1958), 70.

⁴⁷ Moorhouse (1982), 191–2, on the 'open-ended' imperfect: certain verbs, especially of ordering or advising, take an imperfect instead of an aorist when referring to a past, non-durative occurrence, apparently because they initiate an action which needs to be carried out by another. The imperfect will then refer to the mere giving of the order etc., leaving it open whether the order was later carried out.

⁴⁸ So Führer (1967), 62–5, who sees a symmetrical structure underlying lines 65–79, with a general section (65–7) and a concrete section (68–77), the former comprising the topics divine aid (65), victory (66), and fame (67), and the latter comprising the same topics in reverse order: fame (68 ff.), victory (73 ff.), and divine aid (77 ff.).

⁴⁹ Isaac (1986), 86; Her. 7. 126 ὁ διὰ Ἀβδήρων ῥέων ποταμός Νέστος ('the River Nestos flowing through the territory of Abdera'). Feyel (1942–3), 177, thinks that this means it runs through Abdera, but all authorities seem to agree that it flowed some miles to the east.

⁵⁰ Wilamowitz (1913), 251.

subject from the context, e.g. 'Hecate'.⁵¹ Another possibility is that Paian (Apollo) is understood as the subject from the preceding refrain.

However, there is a serious problem in the idea that the first lines of the third triad are the words of a prophecy. Direct speech is generally preceded by a speech-frame, but here the structure would be different, with the prophecy coming first (73–5), then a sentence that specifies a date (75–6), presumably that of the event mentioned in the prophecy,⁵² and finally the speech-frame (77–9). One might argue that the purpose of the hyperbaton would be to produce the effect of abruptness that seems to have been usual at the start of a new triad. But the obscurity is so great that it is better to adopt Fraccaroli's suggestion of *φύρσεν* for *φύρσει*, which would have the effect of making the first sentence of the third triad a continuation of the battle narrative at the end of the second.⁵³

After this the subject seems to change to song, since γ[λ]υκνμάχα-*ρον* almost certainly refers to poetry. The following column (comprising lines 81–95) is unfortunately lost. Wilamowitz suggested that Aphrodite might have been their subject (on the grounds that Aphrodite and Apollo are mentioned at the start, whereas Apollo is mentioned after the lacuna in 95 ff.), but that seems an unreliable inference. I wonder if the transition was not to poetry, with the implication that just as Hecate's prophecy had brought about victory on an earlier occasion, so the present performance of song would help bring about a future victory.⁵⁴

When we pick up the text in lines 96 ff., the focus is Apollo and the songs sung to him by maiden χοροί at Delos and Delphi.⁵⁵ Radt explains this motif as a derivative of the convention of invoking a god by enumerating places where he is worshipped.⁵⁶ But it also serves the purpose of providing a brief panhellenic perspective:

⁵¹ This view goes back to Blass, cited by GH and others; Radt (1958), 65 ff.

⁵² In this I diverge from both Radt (1958) and Führer (1967), 64. To assume that it is the time of the prophecy involves a hyperbaton of thought.

⁵³ Fraccaroli (1909). The accompanying scholion makes it certain that *φύρσει* rather than *φύρσεν* was the transmitted reading.

⁵⁴ For poetry and prophecy see pp. 173–4.

⁵⁵ The bronze voices of the maidens worry Radt, who points out that only men have bronze voices in Homer (*Il.* 5. 785; 18. 222) and that Hes. *The.* 311 calls Cerberus χαλκεόφωνος; but at Soph. *Aj.* 17 Athena's voice is compared to a trumpet with a bronze mouth.

⁵⁶ Radt compares Hom. *Il.* 1. 37–8; Schubart's *Paian* (*GDRK* 52); Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 39; *Ol.* 5. 17; Hom., *Il.* 16. 233.

just as Abderites worship Apollo at Abdera, so χοροί dance at other centres of Apollo's worship, and this comparison seems to add dignity to what would otherwise be a merely epichoric exercise. It is quite possible that there were religious connections between Delphi and Abdera at this period, just as at a later point we hear of Abderite θεωροί being invited to the Delphic Soteria.⁵⁷ Another function has been suggested by Eva Stehle, who argues that such references to female χοροί within songs performed by male χοροί provide a model of integrative community of which a male χορός with its inherent violence and rivalry stands in need.⁵⁸

The song ends in lines 102 ff. with an apostrophe to some deity, probably Abderus, and a prayer to him to advance the cause of the Abderites in a 'final war'. The παιάν refrain follows as if an expansion of the prayer (that works particularly well if the prayer was directed to Apollo). Since the war is in the future, the final παιάν refrain suggests a pre-battle παιάν, whereas the one at the end of the second triad suggested a victory παιάν because it followed the description of victory. It is not made clear who constitute the enemy in the 'final war': in view of the earlier part of the song one thinks of a war against the Thracians, but it is not out of the question that it might be against the Persians.

A *terminus post quem* for the song will be whatever is referred to by 'bearing one's mother's mother'. I argued earlier that this phrase probably refers to one of the refoundations of Teos, and probably to the one after the battle of Lade. Wilamowitz supposed that Pindar would have to have already established a panhellenic reputation to get a commission from the Abderites, and for that reason he doubted whether the song was commissioned before the poet's return from Sicily in 474 BC,⁵⁹ but it seems to me that one could easily turn this argument round: a παιάν for the Abderites may have been a fairly low-profile commission, and one that Pindar is likely to have been predisposed to accept when relatively young. To determine a *terminus ante quem* is much harder. It would help if we had more information about the history of the conflict between Abdera and the Thracian tribes. Against a late date may be the singer's reference to himself as νεόπολις (this would make less sense, say, thirty years after the foundation) and the absence of any explicit

⁵⁷ See Bousquet (1940-1), 100-7 ('Acception de Sotéria par Abdère'); Nachtergael (1977), 445-7 n. 26.

⁵⁸ Stehle (1996), 131.

⁵⁹ Wilamowitz (1913), 253.

reference to either the Persian wars or the hegemony of Athens (the lacunae limit the applicability of this argument from silence). If I had to guess, I would choose an earlier date, perhaps a few years after the battle of Lade.⁶⁰

D3 (*Pa.* III)

str. A [⌘] [~10]ον ἀγλαο-
 [(title)] [~11]ναι Χάριτε[s]
 .[
 col. 9 ιεισ[. .]οξ[
 5 ἀγλαῖαν τ[
 ματέρ[
 ναὸν ο[
 καὶ θυόε[ντα
 βωμὸν[
 χ ὀκτώ κ[
 11 ὑπόθεν[
 αἰοδαῖς ἐν εὐπλε[κέσσι μελι-
 γάρνι, τ[i]ν δέ, χρυσο[
 ὦριον ποτὶ χρόνον
 15 θεᾶς θ' ἐλικάμπυκ[ος
 ἐλαύν[ε]ις ἀν' ἀμβροτ[
 φαεννὸς αἰθήρ
 (lines 18-92 = cols. 10-14 of Π⁺ missing)
 col. 15]ν σθένος ἱεράν
 χαλκ[έ]σπ' αὐλῶν ὀμφάν
 95 ὑπεργανάει,]λος
]θυόντων
]
]
]ολατ[. . .]
]τύπτηι[. .]
]δα[. .]ε χορόν
 [[100

⁶⁰ Radt (1958), 17–19, adopts an agnostic position on the question of date.

Π⁴, cols. 8–15; if Z11–12 (Π⁷ fr. 84) 1 is the last line of D2, line 3 of the same fragment will be the first line of D3 (see n. 6 below). The opening may be alluded to in Himer. Or. 46. 44 Col (see p. 278)

1 ff. ἀγλαό-|θρονοί τε σεμ]ναί Sn 4 IT[, Π[10 κ[ίονας or κ[όραι Schr (1923);
κ[ύκνοι Sn 12 ἐϋπλε[Sn, φωνᾷ μελι-] GH 13 χρυσο[κόμα GH (cf. D5. 41,
D6. 137–8) or χρυσό[τοξε (Ol. 14. 10; Isyllus, παιάν, 48) or χρυσο[χαίτα (Pyth. 2. 16;
Limenios, CA 148. 4) or χρυσό[λυρε (Ar. Thesm. 315 ff.; Erythr. παιάν to Seleukos, 2
(CA 140), SEG 4 (1929), 467. 20) 15 Π⁴: Π¹ τε Π 16 ἀν' ἀμβροτ[ον κέλευθον
GH (cf. Isth. 5. 23 κέλευθον ἂν καθαράν; D7. 12); ἀν' ἀμβρότ[οις ἵπποις Rutherford (cf.
C2. 12) 93 ΠΑΝ 94]' ΟΠ' Π⁴: -λον Π¹ 95 Δᾶ]λος? 100]ΤΥΠΤΗΙ
or ΓΥΠΤΗΝ

Σ 95 (Σ^{ε1}) [.]ιλου μόρια ὑπεργανάει τῷ πυ[ρὶ < 10] | λάμπει, ἐξ οὗ τὰ
ἀγαθὰ σημ[αίνεται

96 (Σ^{ε1}) ἡ ἀνάδοσις τοῦ καπνοῦ

Kharites . . . of splendour . . . mother . . . temple . . . and fragrant . . .
altar . . . (10) eight . . . from high . . . in well-woven songs . . . sweet-voiced,
but for you, golden . . . at the appropriate time and you drive along the
immortal (path) of the goddess with the twisting frontlet . . . the shining
αἰθήρ . . . (93) strength sacred voice of αὐλοί with a bronze mouthpiece . . .
shines above . . . sacrificing . . . (101) χορός

(95) Parts gleam above the fire . . . shines, from which good things are signalled.

(96) Issuing forth of smoke.

A song begins at the penultimate line of col. 8 of Π⁴ and a song ends with line 10 of col. 15; cols. 10–14 are lost. If the beginning and the end belong to the same song, it will have been about 102 lines long (assuming a regular column of 15 lines in the missing section).¹ This seems a plausible reconstruction, since the hypothetical song would be comparable in length to D2, D6, and B2. We have little basis for speculating about the internal structure. If it was triadic, it could have had three triads of 34 lines, comparable to those of D2 (31) or B2 (37). If there were three triads, we would expect a break between strophe and antistrophe to have come somewhere in the first 17 lines. The absence of a παράγραφος in this section suggests that this may not have been the structure. Alternatively, there may have been two triads of, say, 51 lines, comparable to those of D6 (61 lines) or C2 (52 lines). In that case no inter-stanzaic break need have occurred in the first 17 lines. The song would probably be too long for a single triad, and it seems unlikely that it had more than three. A final possibility is that the structure was monostrophic,

¹ Some columns in Π⁴ have 16 lines (see p. 141 and n. 16), but the arithmetic works better if none of the lost columns had 16 lines.

with a strophe length of 17 lines or more (e.g. six strophes of 17 lines). Whatever the structure, the last line may have contained a refrain.²

The Kharites were mentioned in line 2, and they may also have been referred to by the epithet beginning ἀγλαο- in line 1.³ Two possible structures suggest themselves. One is that Apollo and the Kharites were invoked together: in that case, one might read Ἀπολλ[ο]ν in the first line.⁴ The other possibility is that the Kharites were called on to assist the poet in singing of Apollo: in that case]ον might be the end of an epithet referring to Apollo in the accusative.⁵ Little remains of the next few lines: we can make out the word 'mother', perhaps Leto, in line 6; a temple in line 7, an altar fragrant with offerings in lines 8–9; a reference to song in lines 12–13.⁶

From lines 13 ff. an epiphany is being described. There is an address to Apollo (line 13); then mention of a sacred time (line 14) (ᾠριον means 'in season', and we think of the Apolline associations of the Horai implied in D 1. 6).⁷ In line 15 the goddess who is ἐλικάμπυξ ('with twisting frontlet') must be the moon (Pindar uses the same epithet of her in a *Dithurambos*, fr. 75. 19), and line 16 probably

² If line 14 is complete as it is, it is metrically equivalent to line 1 as reconstructed by Snell (δεῦρ' Ἀπολλων, ἀγλαο-), in which case line 14 could be the first line of the antistrophe. This would give an epode of 8 lines, so that line 95 would be the first line of the epode. In his apparatus Snell suggests that line 17 is the last line of the first strophe, but I cannot see any reason for this statement.

³ The epithet ἀγλαόθρονος (Snell) fits the context admirably, used by Pindar of the Muses at *Ol.* 13. 96; it can mean not only 'bright-throned' but also 'with bright flowers' (so Merkelbach (1973a)). For the use of ἀγλαῖαν (line 5) so soon after ἀγλαο- in lines 1–2 compare *G 1.* 15, and 20. Aglaia is the name of one of the Kharites in Hesiod, used also by Pindar (*Ol.* 14. 13; fr. 199. 3).

⁴ Openings: p. 74. The first reconstruction would be consistent with Snell's hypothesis that Z 11–12 (Π' fr. 84) belongs here, i.e. ≠ Δε]ῦρ' Ἀπ[ολλ]ον ἀγλαο-. Kharites and Apollo: *Ol.* 14. 9 ff.; *Nem.* 6. 37 ff.

⁵ Kharites behave like Muses in *Nem.* 10. 1; Bacch. 9. 1; Sappho 53V; 103. 5V; 128V; Stes. *PMG* 212.

⁶ Leto: perhaps also 'mother' at C2. 3. The altar: θυόε[ν]τα presumably goes with βωμόν in line 9 in view of the formula βωμός τε θυήεις ('fragrant altar') at Hom. *Od.* 8. 367; *Il.* 23. 148 (cf. *HH Ap.* 87–8; *HH Ven.* 59; Eur. *Tro.* 1061; Pind. fr. 75. 3); ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντ' ('fragrant navel-stone') at fr. 75. 3. The closing reference to song: editors supplement μελι-|γάρυι in lines 12–13 (cf. D5. 47; *HH Ap.* 518–19), supplying φωνῇ or ὀπί (the noun γάρυς is not Pindaric).

⁷ D1: pp. 255–6. The same sense of ᾠριος at *Pyth.* 9. 98 τελευταῖς | ὥριας ἐν Παλλάδος ('at the seasonal rites of Pallas'); so too at *Thr.* III. 2 (see pp. 23–4). Other instances of the sense 'in season': see Mesomedes, 2. 21 ff. (see p. 279), and Antiphanes, *AG* 10. 100 (= 7 Gow–Page).

refers to an immortal path taken by the moon or Apollo, or both. After that, we glimpse the shining αἰθήρ, which we may imagine was either re-echoing in celebration of the approach of Apollo, or perhaps observing silence.⁸ This is not enough to show the structure of the sentence, but the thought may have been something like: 'When, Apollo, you are about to arrive and you drive along the path of the moon at the sacred time, the αἰθήρ shines around you.'⁹

Some light may be shed on this section by other accounts of Apolline epiphanies. According to Himerius, Alcaeus' *Hymn to Apollo* described how Zeus gave Apollo a swan-chariot to go to Delphi, but Apollo preferred to visit the Hyperboreans; the Delphians summoned him back by singing παιᾶνες, and he arrived in mid-summer.¹⁰ Elsewhere Himerius attributes to Sappho (= fr. 208) and Pindar the idea of Apollo arriving on Helicon in a swan-chariot accompanied by the Muses and the Graces.¹¹ Schroeder suggested that Himerius might be referring directly to D3.¹² Certainly, consideration of the Himerius passage raises interesting possibilities, e.g. that the swan-chariot may have been mentioned in line 10 (ὁκτῶ κ[ύκνοι, κ[ύκλοι?]),¹³ or that the temple and altar referred to in lines 7–8, which one might associate with one of the important centres of

⁸ Stillness in divine epiphany: Bulloch (1985), 181, on Call. *Hy.* 5. 72; Limenios, παιάν, 7–8. What is the αἰθήρ doing? GH thought it was shining, which seems pleonastic. It could be re-echoing, as it does at the birth of Apollo in Call. *Hy.* 4. 258, or observing silence, as in Mesomedes, 2. 1, and Limenios, παιάν, 7–8.

⁹ For example (based on Schroeder's supplements): τ[ί]ν δέ, χρυσοκόμα, Δελφοῦς ὅποι' ἐλθεῖν μέλλεις | ὥριον ποτὶ χρόνον | θεᾶς θ' ἐλικάμπυκ[ος κέλευθον] | ἐλαύν[ε]ις ἄν' ἄμβροτ[ον εὐφάμον ἵησι βρόμον] | φαεινὸς αἰθήρ ('For you, golden-haired one, when you are about to come to Delphi at the seasonal time, and you drive along the immortal path of the moon, the bright αἰθήρ utters an auspicious roar').

¹⁰ Himer. *Or.* 48. 10–11, pp. 200–1 Colonna = Alc. 307cV, cited by Page (1953), 245; see pp. 27–8. Gallavotti (1965) 137, suggests that Pindar might have been influenced by Alcaeus' song. The most recent study is Meyerhoff (1984), 135 ff.

¹¹ 46. 6, pp. 186–7 Colonna τὰ δὲ σὰ νῦν δέον καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Μουσηγέτῃ εἰκάσθαι, οἷον αὐτὸν καὶ Σαπφῶ καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν ᾧδῇ κόμη τε χρυσή καὶ λύρα κοσμήσαντες, κύκνοις ἐποχον εἰς Ἑλικῶνα πέμποναι, Μούσαις Χάρισι τε ὁμοῦ συγχορεύοντα ('It is necessary to compare the present situation to the leader of the Muses himself, the way that Sappho and Pindar represent him in an ode, dressing him with gold hair and a lyre and sending him carried by swans to Helicon, about to dance with the Muses and Kharites'). New readings were supplied from *POsl* 1478, published by Eitrem and Amundsen (1956), 25.

¹² I draw on Cuffari (1983), 89 ff. Compare the discussion of Sim. *PMG* 578 (Himer. *Or.* 62. 54, p. 226 Colonna) in Rutherford (1990), 196.

¹³ Swans appear at the birth of Apollo at Call. *Hy.* 4. 249 ff., making seven circuits but not eight; they are both a Delian feature (Eur. *IT* 1104 ff.; *HF* 692 with Bond's note) and a Delphian one (Eur. *Ion*, 162; Ar. *Birds*, 869 καὶ κύκνω Πυθίῳ καὶ Δηλίῳ). They are regularly associated with the north (the Hebrus in Ar. *Birds*, 769, the

Apolline cult, could belong to a temple of the Muses on Helicon.¹⁴ Another text which seems to share some features with D3 is a much later *Hymn to the Sun* by the imperial poet Mesomedes of Crete (GDRK 2), in which the Sun is identified with Apollo. This song starts with the stillness of the αἰθήρ, earth, sea, wind, mountains, valleys, and birds at the onset of an epiphany; it ends (lines 21 ff.) with the χορός of stars dancing, and the moon leading the way 'at the seasonal time' (χρόνον ὥριον).

The central mythological section of D3 is entirely lost. It seems to have ended with details of performance and cult. In line 94 χαλκ]ξοπ' αὐλῶν ὀμφάν refers to the bronze mouthpiece of an αὐλός. In lines 95–6 the marginal scholia suggest a description of sacrifice; one word in this was probably the hapax ὑπεργανάει, cited as a lemma by the scholiast.¹⁵

As for the place of performance, all we can be reasonably certain of is that it would have been one of the major centres of Apolline cult. Delos cannot be ruled out.¹⁶ If we accept that Himerius was referring to this song, then we might think of a hypothetical cult of Apollo and the Muses on Mount Helicon, perhaps the one at Thespiiai. But even if the arrival of Apollo and the Muses on Helicon was a theme in the song, its performance could have taken place elsewhere. The likeliest candidates would be Thebes and Delphi. In favour of Thebes would be the appropriateness of any praise of Boeotian territory (such as Mount Helicon) in a Theban song. But in the end Delphi must be likelier: Pindar could have introduced Mount Helicon as a sort of way-station on Apollo's journey from the north; and he might have had the Kharites and Muses summoned to Delphi from Helicon, as they are summoned in the

Peneius in *HH* 21, the land of the Hyperboreans at Diod. 2. 48; Ael. *HA* 11. 1). For Apollo and the swan in general see Krappe (1942); Ahl (1982).

¹⁴ So Lieberg (1990), 182–3. According to Hes. *The.* 4, there was an altar of Zeus on Helicon; according to Paus. 9. 27. 5, there was a small temple of the Muses at nearby Thespiiai; Ov. *Met.* 5. 261 gives the Muses a home (i.e. a temple?) on Helicon; von der Mühl (1970) suggests that a temple of the Muses on Helicon may predate Hesiod; Bömer (1959–86), ii. 282–4.

¹⁵ The bronze mouthpiece: mentioned also at *Pyth.* 12. 25; χάλκεοψ occurs only here. The sacrifice: compare γανάειν at D7. 8. The μόρια mentioned in Σ are perhaps divisions of the sacrifice.

¹⁶ Image of an epiphany of Apollo at Delos: cf. Amphora, Athens, National Museum 3961 (911) (*LIMC* s.v. *Apollo*, 1005; Papastamos (1970), 12 ff.), dated to c. 650 BC, usually taken to represent Apollo arriving at Delos accompanied by the Hyperborean maidens. Note the possible supplement Δά]λος in line 95.

introductions of two Hellenistic *Paianes* preserved on stone at Delphi.¹⁷

D4 (*Pa.* IV)

| | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| str. A | [⌘ | υ υ - υ υ - υ υ] | Ἄρτεμιν | |
| | [Κείοις | -- υ -- υ υ] | ύσομαι | |
| | εις ?] | -- υ -- υ υ] | ος αὐδάν· | |
| | | υ υ υ - υ υ] | γυν]αικῶν ἐδνώσατο | 3 |
| 5 | υ - υ - x -] | ωδ' ἐπέων δυνατώτερον· | | |
| col. 16 | -- υ υ] | ᾱ κατὰ πᾶσαν ὁδὸν | | |
| | υ υ - υ - | | | |
| | ῆ] | συχίαν Κέω - υ υ - υ υ - | | 6 |
| | -- υ υ -- υ υ - | | | |
| | [___ | υ υ - υ υ - υ υ] | άλλεται | |
| ant. A | 11 | υ υ - υ υ -] | ν χρόνον ὀρνύει | |
| | -- υ -] | Δᾶλον ἀγακλέα | | |
| | -- υ - -] | Χάρισι· Κάρθαι- | | |
| | | [α μὲν υ - - ἐλα] | χύνωτον στέρνον χθονός | 3 |
| 15 | υ - υ - x -] | γιν Βαβυλῶνος ἀμείβομαι | | |
| | -- υ υ -] | έχεται πεδίω | | |
| | υ υ - υ - | | | |
| | -- υ υ] | οι· θεῶν [· υ υ υ υ - | | 6 |
| | -- υ υ - υ υ -] | ρη· | | |
| | [___] | υ υ - υ υ - υ υ] | ν ἰχθύσιν. | |
| col. 17 | ep. A | 21 | ἦτοι καὶ ἐγὼ σ[κόπ]ελον ναίων δια- | |
| | | | γινώσκομαι μὲν ἀρεταῖς ἀέθλων | |
| | | | Ἑλλανίσιν, γινώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ | |
| | | | Μοῖσαν παρέχων ἄλῃς· | |
| | | 25 | [ε]ῖ καὶ τι Διω[νύ]σου ἄρο[υ]ρα φέρει | 3 |
| | | | βιόδωρον ἀμαχανίας ἄκος, | |
| | | | ἄνιππός εἰμι καὶ βουνομίας ἀδαέστερος· | |
| | | χ | ἀλλ' ὃ γε Μελάμπος οὐκ ἤθελεν | 6 |
| | | | λιπὼν πατρίδα μο[να]ρχε[ῖν] Ἄργει | |

¹⁷ Thebes and Helicon: see on Cz. 11, p. 250. Muses summoned from Helicon: Athenaios' παιάν, 1 ff.; Limenios' παιάν, 1 ff.

21 διά[σαμον Housman (1908) 25 Wil: '[H]l GH: Διφ[νύσ]ον Nairn ap. GH
 28 Π (cf. D'Alessio (1991)): Μέλαμπος GH 32 ἐστία Wil 33 φ[ερέ]γγω Wil;
 φ[έρι]στ' αἰεί οἱ σ[οφώ]ι καλὰ (φίλα)· D'Alessio (1991) 34 ματ[αί]ων δ' ἐ[πλετ'] ἔρωσ
 τῶν Housman (1908) 35-6 Εὐξαν[τίου]-|{ο} or {ο} ἐπαίνεσα Π 36 [Κρητ]ῶν
 Housman (1908): ἀ[λί]κ[ων] GH ἀνα[ίνετο] GH: ἀνά[νατο] Wil 37 ἀπάρχειν Wil
 ('reign far away': cf. *Nem.* 4. 46) 38 (σύν) Housman: (ἔξ) Wil υἱ[οῖ]-σι(ν) GH
 (assuming [πῶ]s in 49) 39 γέρας Weil (1908); πέρας Wil 41 'Εννοσιδα Wil
 46 τ' Π⁸ 48 ΕΧΩΠ, followed by a low point, the only one in Π⁴ λι Π^{8c}: λι Π^{8c}
 49 Housman (1908): [πῶ]s Bury ap. GH (too short); [σῶ]s Blass ap. GH (postulat-
 ing (οὐ) before λίαν in 48) 50 ff. Plut. *Exil.* 602 F ἐλαφράν κυπάρισσον φιλέειν,
 ἐάν δέ νομόν Κρήτας περιδαίω. ἐμοὶ δ' ὀλίγον μὲν γὰς δέδοται, ὄθεν ἄδρυσ, πενθέων δ'
 οὐκ ἔλαχον στασίων 51 Rutherford: ΝΟΜὸν ΠΕΡΙΔΑΪΟΝ Π, Περίδαϊον Hermann
 (1798-9), περιδᾶϊον Schneider (1776), περινάϊον Lloyd-Jones (1993) 52 δοται θα
 Σ θά[μνος] Blass ap. GH; -νου, -νοιο, -νων, Sn μέρος Erbse ap. SnMae; πέδον Sn;
 γαῖας θέναρ Lloyd-Jones (1993) 53 Blass ap. GH

Σ 4 (Σ^{δ2}) (ἐδνώ)σατο· (Σ^{ε1}) ἀντὶ ὑμνήθη[< 10]
 13 (Σ^{ε1}) πόλ[ις] Καρθ[ά]α τῆς πενταπόλεως τῆς [Κέ(ω)]
 16 (Σ^{ε2}) [< 13]... αἰς... μετ' τίθεται | [οὐδέν γὰρ ὑπάρχ]ει πεδίω ἐπὶ
 τῶν νήσῳ
 25 (Σ^{ε1}) δώρημα τῷ βίῳ
 28 (Σ^ε) [?]ιν... [~11] .τ[...].[...]. | [~26]εμ[...]. [~26]

Ἄργους

38 (Σ^ε) καιῶς[< 30] | πει ο[...].[...].ιφ[...]. [< 20]
 50 (Σ^{ε1}) τὴν Κρήτην ἐπεὶ πολλὰ ἐκεῖ [κυ-] | ἀρίσσοι γίνονται
 52 (Σ^{δ1}) δε[δοται] θά[μνου] | []λαχο[ν]
 58 (Σ^{ε1}) ζῆ(τεῖται)· Κεαρὶον ηρω
 60 (Σ^{ε2}) τινέ[ς] τῶν Εὐξαντίου πα[ίδω]ν τὴν Κέων [κατ]ώκισαν
 61a (Σ^{δ3}) κερ[α]ρ[...]. | υἱό(ς) Τηλ[...]. ὁ εἰπ[...]
 61b (Σ^{δ2}) ἀ[ν(τὶ τοῦ) οἶχο]μαι

4 ὑμνηθῆ[GH 13 πόλ[ις] αὐτῇ] μία GH, Hope (1986) 16 Sn 38 καιῶς
 [λέγει περὶ τῶν ἐξ υἱῶν] ἐπεὶ οὐ τῆς Π[α]ρ[α]φά[της] ἦσαν πάντες Diehl (1917) 52 θ
 Π⁸, i.e. λάθο[ν] (?) 58 Sn: κεδνὸν ἦρω GH 60 Wil: -κησαν Π 61a υἱό(ς) GH,
 Τηλ[έκλ]ο(ς) Wil (cf. Storck (1912)); υἱό(ς) Τήλ[εκλ]ο(ς), Τηλ[άγρ]ο(ς) Huxley (1965)
 61b GH; alternatively Ἀρ[ιστοφά]ν(ης) GH, Ἀρ[ιστοφ]άν(ικος) Rutherford

TRIAD A. [For the Ceians . . .] . . . Artemis . . . I shall dance (?) . . . voice . . .
 of women received (the song) as a bride-price . . . more powerful than
 words . . . in every way . . . peace for Ceos . . . time . . . arouses . . . famous
 Delos . . . with Graces. Carthaea [indeed is but] a narrow ridge of land,
 [yet I will not] exchange it for Babylon . . . plains . . . gods . . . fish . . . Even
 I who dwell on a rock am known for Greek excellence in contests, known
 also for providing the Muse in plenty. Even if my land produces Dionysus'
 life-giving remedy for distress, I am without horses and rather unskilled
 in the tending of oxen. But Melampus was unwilling, having left his native
 country, to become sole king of Argos, laying down the gift of divination.
Ie ie, O ie Paian.

TRIAD B. [Dear to a man is] his own home city and . . . and kinsmen, so that he is well content. But to foolish men [belongs a love] for things afar. I commend the saying of King Euxantius, who, although the men of Crete so desired, would not consent to rule alone or to take a seventh share of her hundred cities along with the sons of Pasiphae; but he declared to them his omen: 'I fear the war of Zeus, I fear the loudly thundering Earthshaker. Once they sent the land and a countless host into the depths of Tartarus with thunderbolt and trident, while they left alone my mother and her well-walled home. And, after this, am I to hold a great estate elsewhere, striving after wealth and thrusting into complete neglect the local ordinance of the gods? There would be too much fear always. Leave, my heart, the cypress-tree; leave the dwellings that surround Ida. Only a few bushes . . . have been given to me . . . but I have had no lot in sorrow or in strife . . .' *Ie ie, O ie Paian.*

(4) (ἐδνῶ)σατο instead of 'was sung'. (13) Karthaia was a member of the πεντάπολις of Ceos. (16) . . . (for there are no) plains in these islands. (25) A gift for life. (28) . . . Argos . . . (50) Crete, since many cypress-trees grow there. (52) There is a share of bushes (?). (58) A problem: the hero Kearsios. (60) Some of the children of Euxantius settled Ceos. (61a) . . . son of Tel[. . .] . . . (61b) Instead of 'I have gone'.

D4 was performed by Ceians, who may have come from Karthaia in the south-east of Ceos (line 13), since Ceos was not fully federated at this time.¹ In any case, the traditions of choral song seem to have been unusually strong at Karthaia (compare lines 23 ff.), even though this was not the most powerful city in Ceos.² A number of other lyric songs with Ceian connections survive: we have a fragment of song in the Doric dialect with the title Δη[μήτρος

¹ Karthaia was in the south-east of Ceos, the closest to Delos of the island's four cities (not five, as the scholiast thinks: p. 150). Lewis (1962) suggested that full federal unity between Iulis, Koressia, and Karthaia (not Poiessa) was not achieved until Ceos joined Euboea in revolting from Athens in 411 BC. Certainly, the cities seem to have coined separately until midway through the century, c.465 BC in the case of Iulis, c.450 in the case of Karthaia and Koressia (cf. Robinson (1949), 329). For the purposes of the Athenian coinage decree Ceos was regarded as a unity, but it is unclear whether this implies any degree of federalization. Whatever the political realities, a degree of 'sentimental unity' (Lewis (1962), 2) is demonstrated by Bacch. 2, in which the χορός summon the Muse to Ceos and talk of the seventy victories 'we' have won.

² Athen. 456 F implies that Simonides trained a χορός in a χορηγεῖον there; cf. also IG xii/5. 544 A2. 14 (4th-3rd cents. BC) (cited in n. 6 below); in Antoninus Liberalis 1 (derived from Nicander, *Heteroionumena*) Hermochares first saw Ctesylla dancing at Karthaia (Calame (1977a), 177 ff., 207-8); Ctesylla was from Iulis, which could suggest either that pan-Ceian χοροί danced at Karthaia or that χοροί from different towns competed there. Not Karthaia, but Koressia was the most powerful city at the time, to judge from the fact that it paid tribute independently in 450 BC (Lewis (1962), 2; *ATL* iii. 198). A Ceian pyxis representing dance is discussed by Tölle (1964), 52, 83.

Κείois, perhaps by Simonides;³ also Bacch. 17, the ending of which seems to indicate that it was performed by Ceians;⁴ and several *Epinikia* for Ceian victors by Bacchylides (1, 2, 6, 7, and possibly 8).

The song had something to do with Delos (line 12). Strong links between Ceos and Delos were already known from Herodotus' reference to a Ceian *ἑστιατόριον* on Delos,⁵ and from epigraphical evidence: an inscription from the fourth–third centuries BC specifying that a certain Aristopeithes was honoured *χορηγήσας παισὶν εἰς Δῆλον* ('for supplying a *chorós* for the boys to Delos'), which must refer to a *θεωρία* and could well continue a tradition;⁶ also an inscription from the Hellenistic or imperial period talking about an offering sent from Ceos to Delos.⁷ Pindar seems to refer to a Ceian song in honour of Delos in the proem to *Isthmian* 1. He does not mention the genre, but the Hellenistic commentator whose views are recorded in the scholia thought that the song was a *Δηλιακὸς παιάν* (he also calls it a *προσοδιακὸς παιάν*). It seems likely that both poet and commentator were thinking of D4. In view of what we know about the connection between *παιᾶνες* and *θεωρία*, it would be a natural inference that D4 was performed by Ceians on Delos, but there may be an alternative solution.

It is unfortunate that we do not know the date of *Isthmian* 1: otherwise we would be in a strong position to date D4. It could be argued that we would not expect Pindar to have composed a *παιάν* for the Ceians before the death of Simonides in 468 BC.⁸ Bacchylides' probable survival until at least 452 BC need not be a counter-argument, since he may not have been held in the same es-

³ *SLG* 460 = *POxy* 2625 fr. 1(b) and following fragments. The song has the distinctive refrain *ἴτω ἴτω χορός* ('Let the *chorós* go, let it go'), on which see Rutherford (1995c). The song may have been a *προσόδιον*, perhaps performed at the Athenian Eleusinia.

⁴ 17. 128 ff. For the genre of this song see pp. 98–9.

⁵ 4. 35; Bruneau (1970), 110 n. 1.

⁶ *IG* xii/5. 544 A2. 16 (4th–3rd cents. BC) mentions a magistrate called a *χορηγός* and lines 35 ff. read *ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλεξιτέλους Ἀριστοπειθέως Ἐρασικλείους χορηγήσας παισὶν εἰς Δῆλον στεφανωθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ ἀνέθηκεν τὸν στέφανον τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι δραχμὰς ἑκατόν* ('In the magistracy of Alexiteles Aristopeithes, son of Erasikleies, supplied a *chorós* for children for Delos, and, having been crowned by the *dēmos* with a gold crown, he dedicated the crown in honour of Apollo—one hundred *δραχμαί*'); see Pridik (1892), 87 ff., 124 ff., 138 ff.

⁷ *ID* 253; Bruneau (1970), 141–4, 108.

⁸ Puech (1931), 17–18. Gaspar (1900), 150 ff., suggested 458, Wilamowitz (1922), 341 for 474, but these are hardly more than guesses. On the question of date see Hope (1986), 10 ff.

teem as Simonides.⁹ But we hardly know enough about the general principles of the commissioning of sacred songs or the details of this case to be able to assert that Pindar could not have composed the song while Simonides was still alive.

D4 consists of two triads, with triad-final refrain. The second triad starts with a new sentence, and new sentences begin at the beginning of the antistrophe and epode in the second triad, perhaps at the beginning of the epode in the first triad also. The first triad is introductory: the antistrophe and epode contain an encomium of Ceos, finished off with a mythological paradigm, the second starting with a gnome and progressing rapidly to a mythological paradigm about Euxantius and Ceos, concluding with a speech by him.

The badly damaged first strophe seems to have contained an invocation of Artemis and probably Apollo. The gift of song is compared to a bride-price (line 4 *ἐδνώσεται*), a metaphor which was later taken up by Callimachus in the proem of the *Victoria Berenices*.¹⁰ *κατὰ πᾶσαν ὁδόν* in line 6 is probably not a literal description of movement to Delos but a metaphorical reference to the road of wisdom (compare A1. 4); line 7 looks as if it might be part of a prayer for peace for Ceos (compare D1, and the end of Bacch. fr. 4); line 11 may contain a reference to the special sacred time of the festival at which the song was being performed (compare D3. 14).

From line 13 almost to the end of the triad the subject is the island of Ceos—its advantages and disadvantages, moving from physical geography (lines 13–17; the fish referred to in line 20 may be part of this) to human accomplishments (lines 21–4) and agriculture (lines 25–7). An important technique for praising an island was to state the disadvantages by way of a foil to the advantages. We find this technique in the *Odyssey*: at *Od.* 9. 21 ff. Odysseus tells Alcinoüs that Ithaca is rough, but a good nurse of young men; at 13. 242 ff. Athena tells Odysseus that Ithaca is rough and not for driving horses—not utterly bad, but not broad—

⁹ Another possibility is that Bacchylides was exiled. See Plut. *Exil.* 605 D; Körte (1918), 14–17.

¹⁰ *SH* 254A. 1 (=fr. 383. 1 Pfeiffer) *Ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέη τι χάρισιον ἔδνον ὀφείλω* ('To Zeus and Nemea I owe a pleasant wedding gift'). The sense of *ἐδνώσεται* is illuminated by Käppel (1992b), 96–8, who makes a good comparison with *Ol.* 7. 1–10. I disagree with Käppel about the tense of the verb: the Σ, which reads an aorist, must be likelier, and we can make sense of it as an instantaneous aorist, describing an event that is imagined as just having taken place.

but it has corn, wine, rain and dew, pasture for goats and cows, forest of all sorts, and year-round watering-holes.¹¹ This rhetoric of antithesis between advantage and disadvantage comes through in Pindar's encomium of Ceos. In some cases we find the disadvantages stated without corresponding advantages: Ceos is a breast of land with a short back, i.e. narrow (line 14);¹² it has no plains, i.e. it is rough (line 16); Ceians have no horses (line 27).¹³ Elsewhere disadvantages are paired with advantages. Thus, (disadvantage) Ceos is a short-backed breast of land (line 14), (advantage) but I would not change it for Babylon (line 15);¹⁴ (disadvantage) lack of plains (line 16?) vs. (advantage) divine dispensation (line 17?); (disadvantage) even though I dwell on a rock (line 21), (advantages, linked by anaphora)¹⁵ on the one hand, I am known for athletic prowess in panhellenic contests¹⁶ and on the other I am known for song¹⁷ (compare Gg. 2-6). Lines 25-7 seem to be a self-conscious inversion of this pattern, with the advantage pre-

¹¹ Cf. also Hom. *Od.* 4. 601 ff.: Telemachus refuses a gift of horses because Ithaca has no plains to race horses on; Kienville (1936), 61 ff. Other criticism of islands: *HH Ap.* 51 ff.; fr. iamb. ades. 21 (*ALG* 3. 77 = Plut. *Exil.* 602 C) σκληρὸν ἄκαρπον καὶ φυτεύσθαι κακὴν ('rough, fruitless, and hard to plant').

¹² See Archil. *IEG* 21 (of Thasos): ἦδε δ' ὥστ' ὄνου ῥάχιν | ἔστηκεν ὕλης ἀγρίης ἐπιστεφής ('It stands like the back-bone of an ass, covered in wild woods'); Plato, *Crito*, 111 B. For ἐλα]χύνωντον (or βρα]χύν-) see G5. 6-7; Z20. 7. With στέρνον χθονός compare Soph. *OC* 469 στερνούχου χθονός ('land having a breast'). See Kienville (1936), 9 ff., 31.

¹³ For an island without horses see Sim. *PMG* 591; Bacch. 8. 15. Conversely, Pindar can praise cities for being rich in horses: see D1. 7; perhaps G11 (fr. 215(b)) 12-13. Limitations of Ceian agriculture: Aeschylides, *Περὶ γεωργίας* ap. Aelian, *Hist. Anim.* 16. 32.

¹⁴ Cf. ps.-Phocylides fr. 4 (*ALG* 1. 58) καὶ τότε Φωκυλίδου πόλιν ἐν σκοπέλῳ κατὰ κόσμον | οἰκεῦσα σμικρὴ κρέσσων Νίνου ἀφραινούσης ('Phocylides said this also: a small city on a rock well governed is better than an insane Nineveh'); we cannot be sure that this predates D4 (West, *IEG* 2. 93, is sceptical); more statements of refusing exchange: Sappho 16V (Anactoria ode), 17 ff.; Anacr. *PMG* 361; Eur. *Her.* 643 ff.

¹⁵ δια-|γινώσκειν . . . | . . . γινώσκ[ο]μα[ι]: by dint of an old Indo-European construction, the prefix is omitted the second time: see Watkins (1966); Renehan (1969), 77 ff., citing this passage; Puhvel (1970), 50-1; sceptically Dunkel (1978), 14 ff.

¹⁶ Bacchylides mentions seventy Ceian victories at 2. 9-10, and from Iulis we have a stone slab recording Ceian victories: *IG* xii/5. 608; Pridik (1892), 160-1 n. 39; Jebb (1905), 186-7.

¹⁷ The line is sometimes taken to refer to Simonides and Bacchylides; Wilamowitz (1922), 325, even suggested that the meiotic ἄλις is meant to denigrate the Ceian poets, but this seems unlikely in a song sung by Ceians (Müller (1914), 19). It is more likely to refer to a general reputation for song (with self-reference); so at Bacch. 2. 11 ff. Μοῦσα' αὐθιγενής ('The native Muse'): Gelzer (1985). Cassio (1972) takes it with the preceding lines, Μοῦσαν being the epinician Muse ('material for song').

sented first as the qualification and then the disadvantage as the main idea: the advantage is that Ceos produces wine, the healing of Dionysus (the idea of healing reflects the genre, though the presence of Dionysus is disconcerting);¹⁸ the disadvantage is that the Ceians are without horses and rather unacquainted with pasturage of cattle.

This section is answered by a short mythological paradigm concerning Melampus, who as a prophet and a healer is quite at home in a *παιάν*.¹⁹ Since Grenfell and Hunt, the paradigm has usually been taken as saying not just that Melampus did not want to become king at Argos, but that he did not want to leave Pylos, bringing *λιπών* within the scope of the *οὐκ*. The force of the line must be that Melampus preferred his *οἰ[ω]νοπόλον γέρας* ('prerogative of being a diviner'), though *θέμενος* seems to be ambiguous, capable of meaning either 'laying down' (laying down his role as a prophet was something he would have to do if he became king at Argos) or 'assuming' (assuming it was something he would do if he declined to become king).²⁰ Unfortunately, the inference that Melampus did not leave Pylos is at variance with all other versions of the myth, in which he not only left but, having cured the Proetides, demanded a share of the kingdom of Argos as a fee for his services—in many versions two shares, one for himself and one for his brother Bias.²¹ How do we explain the discrepancy? Is Pindar alluding to an otherwise lost variant of the myth? Or is the motif of Melampus' refusal to leave Pylos a Pindaric innovation, introduced to exonerate him from the charge of using prophetic skill for financial gain?²² An interpretation closer to the other traditions would be preferable, if it can be found, and one

¹⁸ Cf. Bacch. 6. 5; 8. 12; also D2 n. 25 (on D2. 25). Hope (1986), 50, refers to Ceian coins on which bunches of grapes appear (see Head (1911), 482–4). A Mycenaean temple at Korossia was reused as a temple of Dionysus in the classical period: see Eisner (1972).

¹⁹ This point also in Hope (1986), 18.

²⁰ The sense 'laying down' for the middle of *τίθημι* is used by Sappho: of anger at 103. 4V, of a lyre at 103. 9V; of a burden at Ar. *Lys.* 312; also of weapons (LSJ A11. 10a, c) and voting (A II. 5). It is more common than the sense 'taking on', which occurs in *Pyth.* 4. 28–9 and 113, and is defended for this passage by LSJ s.v. C3; Slater (1969a), s.v.; Grandolini (1984–5), 61–2.

²¹ Half in Her. 9. 34, two-thirds in most other sources (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 2. 2). This conflicts with *μο[να]ρχε[ῖν]* in 29, but Pindar is simplifying, and he may have wanted to stress the parallel with Euxantius, who was offered complete control (*αὐταρχεῖν* at line 37) of Crete. The latest attempts to unscramble these versions are Maehler (1982–97), i/1. 196 ff., and West (1985), 78 ff.; Loeffler (1963).

²² Farnell (1930), i. 303–4; van der Kolf (1923), 20–3; Thummer (1957), 14–15.

has been proposed recently by Käppel, who gives the participle λιπών a broader scope, governing the whole sentence, and takes the force of the sentence to be that having left, and having cured the Proetides, Melampus could have become sole monarch at Argos, but chose to be joint ruler only, so that he did not have to lay down his prophetic prerogative.²³ Thus, what the paradigm would illustrate would be not so much a reluctance to leave a humble native land, but rather a reluctance to give absolute value to wealth and power. Ingenious as it is, this interpretation is not wholly persuasive; in the end leaving still seems to be part of what Pindar implies Melampus was unwilling to do. All things considered, it may be better to posit some otherwise lost variant or literary treatment (the *Melampodia*?) in which Melampus' departure was reluctant.²⁴

The second triad follows on from the end of the first with a gnome about preferring the near to the far.²⁵ This is illustrated with a paradigm drawn from Ceian mythology concerning Euxantius, who was offered a share of the kingdom of Minos but declined. The presentation of the myth takes the form of a speech by Euxantius, which is introduced by a fairly short introductory formula. The speech was at least 15 lines long, and may have continued to the end of the triad.²⁶ The combination of long speech and short introductory formula is very rare: the only parallel would be Medea's speech at *Pyth.* 4. 9 ff.²⁷ The effect of this structure is dramatic: it is as if the Ceian χορός impersonate Euxantius at this dramatic moment in his life.

The main sources for the myth, besides D4, are Bacch. 1 (unfortunately very fragmentary towards the beginning) and a version by the historian Xenomedes of Ceos (fifth century BC), which sur-

²³ Käppel (1992b), 133 ff.

²⁴ See D'Alessio (1994b).

²⁵ Hubbard (1985), 26–7. A similar use of οἴκοθεν at *Nem.* 3. 31, of μάταιος at *Pyth.*

3. 21.

²⁶ Wilamowitz (1922), 326, thought that Euxantius' speech continued to the end of the song, as in *Nem.* 1 (indirect speech), *Ol.* 4, and Bacch. 15, and that 'der Paeanruf ist nur äußerlich den Epoden angestückt'; Führer (1967), 59 n. 86, compares this hanging παιάν refrain to the final χαίρε greeting of a *Homeric Hymn*. Closure via monologue in lyric poetry is discussed by Esser (1976), 129 ff.

²⁷ Führer (1967), 81 ff., suggests that they can in general be analysed into three sections: (1) a presentation of the theme, along the lines of 'I praise this speech' (here lines 35–6); (2) a specification of the situation, often introduced by a relative pronoun referring to the speech (here lines 36–9; Führer regards the personal relative pronoun ὅς in line 36 as anomalous); and (3) a speech introduction (here lines 39–40).

vives in Call. *Aitia*, fr. 75. 64 ff.²⁸ It is presupposed that the early inhabitants of Ceos were Telchines or Phlegyaes and that they were visited by a thunderbolt because they corrupted the harvest.²⁹ The most important survivor was Dexithea, saved because she had entertained the gods, as her name suggests.³⁰ Pindar makes her the only survivor, perhaps in order to accentuate the gravity of the disaster.³¹ In most versions, including that of Bacchylides, some of Dexithea's sisters survived also, and went on to found the northern Ceian city of Koressia; Callimachus says that Dexithea's mother Macelo survived as well (though Nicander makes Macelo a sister who was killed along with her husband).³² On the third day after the disaster Minos arrived with fifty ships and married Dexithea; then, leaving half his army, he sailed back; nine months later Dexithea bore Euxantius.³³ The theoxenic character of the myth is clear, and we may expect it to have been associated with a theoxenic type of festival in which a god or gods were symbolically represented as coming to partake in a sacrificial meal.³⁴

The story of how Euxantius was offered a seventh share in the Cretan throne is known only from D4. This seems to imply that Minos and Pasiphae had six children, which is different from the usual version, in which they had four. The story may reflect the Minoan activity in Ceos that has come to light with the excavations at Ayia Irini.³⁵

²⁸ *FGrH* 442 F 4; cf. lines 53 ff., 74; cf. Huxley (1965), 235 ff.; Storck (1912); Harder (1990).

²⁹ Telchines: ΣB (a*b*) on Ov. *Ibis*, 475. Phlegyaes: Nonn. 18. 36 (apparently); Nonnus may be drawing on Euphoriion (*CA* 115, 119 van Groningen = Serv. on *Aen.* 6. 618 (Thilo and Hagen (1881–1902), ii. 87. 15)); now with *SH* 443; so La Penna (1957), 121–2.

³⁰ Other versions of the name are Dexione in the ΣP to Ov. *Ibis*, 475, and Dexithoe in ΣB (a*b*).

³¹ The epithet makes it clear that οἶκον does not mean 'household' (which would imply that there were other survivors; so Maehler (1982–97), i/2. 6). So Flückiger-Guggenheim (1984), 43.

³² Daughters: Bacch. 1. 138. Foundation of Koressia: Maehler (1982–97), i/2. 8, (1970), xl; Pridik (1892), 7 n. 2). Macelo, Call. fr. 75. 67; Nicander, fr. 116; ΣG , C (F*D*), Z on Ov. *Ibis*, 475; Maehler (1982–97), i/2, p. xl. Nonn. 18. 35 says Ζῆνα καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα μετ' ἐξείνισσε Μακελλῶ ('Macello hosted Zeus and Apollo on one day (?)'), which may imply that Macelo was another surviving sister; see Flückiger-Guggenheim (1984), 43.

³³ Bacch. 1. 112 ff.

³⁴ For theoxenies see p. 310.

³⁵ Sons of Minos: four were Katreus, Deucalion, Glaucus, and Androgeos, the last of whom died before Minos (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3. 15. 5–7). The solution that each of these three had two shares and Euxantius the remaining seventh seems less than

In portraying the decision of Euxantius Pindar presents him as a sort of seer (one thinks of Melampus), who 'told them his portent', which presumably means that he interpreted the recent thunderbolt as a portent for himself.³⁶ What he fears is the war of Zeus, god of thunder, and Poseidon, god of the earthquake. Euxantius argues that if he were to leave he would be thrusting aside the *μακάρων τ' ἐπιχώριον* | *τεθμὸν π[ά]μπαν ἐρῆμον* (46–7), a phrase that admits of several interpretations. Since *τεθμός* can mean 'festival', it might refer to the local cults of the gods, which Euxantius' hypothetical departure would render desolate (with *ἐρῆμον* used proleptically). Or it could refer to an ordinance or decision of the gods concerning Ceos,³⁷ either the recent one that all the Telchines should die except for Euxantius and Dexitheia, or that Euxantius should rule Ceos, or the earlier and more general ordinance that Ceos should be a poor island. Euxantius' departure would make the gods' decision *ἐρῆμος*, perhaps 'vain', although this is an unattested sense; alternatively, and I think this is more likely, the decision is said to be 'desolate' by metonymy, since the state of the island decreed by the gods is desolate.

Euxantius' renunciation of Crete is expressed in emotional language, introduced by asyndeton and an unusual address to the *φρήν*.³⁸ The use of *ἔα* in this context perhaps reflects a line of Archilochus (*IEG* 116):³⁹ *ἔα Πάρον καὶ σῦκα κείνα καὶ θαλάσσιον βίον* ('Away with Paros, those figs and the life of the seal'). Euxantius contrasts the cypresses of Crete with the more modest environment of Ceos.⁴⁰ In the last surviving line of his monologue he announces that he is free of sorrow and strife. After that, he

likely; for other solutions see Huxley (1965), 242 n. 49. Minoan activity in Ceos: Huxley (1965); Eisner (1972); Caskey (1986), 36–9.

³⁶ Cf. *τέρας λέγεις* ('you speak a wonder') at Plato, *Hipp. Ma.* 283 c; *τερατόλογος* at Plato, *Phaedr.* 229 E. Does *τρέω*—the first word of his speech—suggest a folk-etymological connection with *τέρας*?

³⁷ For *τεθμός* = festival: *Ol.* 6. 69; *Nem.* 10. 33; Flückiger-Guggenheim (1984), 43. *τεθμός* = ordinance: *Ol.* 8. 25; so Hope (1986), 73 ff.; Slater (1969a).

³⁸ Vocative of *φρήν* only here in early Greek poetry. *θυμέ* is more common in self-exhortations: *Ol.* 2. 89; *Nem.* 3. 26; fr. 123. 1; fr. 127. *φρήν* is more active in Pindar than in Homer: Darcus (1979), 171–2.

³⁹ From the point of view of sense *ἔασον* in *G10* (fr. 215a) 4 is also comparable. For the antithetical style Führer (1967), 139, compares Croesus' speech at Bacch. 3. 37 ff.

⁴⁰ Cretan cypress-trees: Meiggs (1982), 99; the Cretan *μέλαθρον* at Delphi mentioned at *Pyth.* 5. 39 ff. is of cypress-wood.

perhaps went on to say that he was blessed in his children, since a scholion says that some of his children established settlements in Ceos.⁴¹ That assertion is confirmed by Callimachus' statement (fr. 67. 5) that Acontius was a Euxantid. In saying that *some* of the children of Euxantius settled in Ceos, the scholion also implies that some went abroad. And this is supported by the tradition that he had a son called Miletus who founded the city of the same name.⁴² It is clear that the Euxantidai were not the only settlers of Ceos. The four founders of the Ceian cities mentioned by Callimachus, fr. 75. 70 ff. (presumably from Xenomedes of Ceos), are not said to be sons of Euxantius.⁴³ Since Bacchylides says that Minos left half his army on Ceos, they may have been Cretans. Alternatively, they could have been Ionians from Athens (though against that is the tradition that the Ionian founder was called Thersidamas).⁴⁴

Several names are mentioned in scholia on the final lines of D4, and these may have been mentioned in the speech of Euxantius. 'Kearios' (if this is the right interpretation) is entirely unknown, but his name is remarkably similar to the name of the island; *νῖδ(ς) Τηλ[* has been connected with a report by Strabo that a certain Teleklos, an early Spartan king, colonized 'Poiaessa', though it is uncertain whether he meant Poieessa in Ceos;⁴⁵ in view of other connections known between Ceos and Miletus, *Ῥοειτ[ῆς* may perhaps be the eponym of the Milesian Onitadai, an ob-

⁴¹ Cf. Σ on line 60. We hear of his children—the Euxantidae—in ΣP and B(a*b*) on Ov. *Ibis*, 475.

⁴² Aristocrates of Miletus, *FGrH* 493 F 3 (ΣA.R. 1. 186, 23. 16 Wendel).

⁴³ Megacles (Karthaiia), Eupylus (Iulis), Acaeus (Poieessa), Aphrastus (Koressia). Callimachus says nothing about the genealogy, except that the mother of Eupylus was a certain Chryso; Huxley (1965), 243, suggests that the true reading might be Brizo, the Delian demigoddess (Semios of Delos, *FGrH* 396 F 4).

⁴⁴ Dionysius, *Perieg.* 525 (*GGM* ii. 451^a4). Jacoby, *FGrH* iiiB Text 290. 7–10, is in favour of the Ionian hypothesis, whereas Storck (1912), 24, goes for the sons of Euxantius.

⁴⁵ Storck (1912), 18; Wilamowitz (1922), 476, drawing on Strabo, 8. 4. 4 (temple of Athena Nedusia at Poiaessa named after somewhere in Messenia called Nedon, whence Teleklos colonized Poiaessa, Echeiae, and Tragion), and 10. 5. 6 (temple of Nedusia Athena in Poieessa in Ceos). Wilamowitz thinks that Echeiae and Tragion were on Ceos also, but others suppose that Tragion at least is in Messenia (F. Bölte, *RE* s.v. xiiA. 1896). Another problem is that the Teleklos mentioned by Strabo is probably the Spartan king mentioned by Her. 7. 204, and no relation of Euxantius; Huxley (1965), 244 n. 59, thinks that the text of Strabo, 8. 4. 4, has been interpolated by someone who knew about Ceos, referring to Boeckh (1858–74), vii. 356; Pridik (1892), 9; Huxley (1962) 31.

scure clan known from the inscription regulating the duties of the *Μολοί*.⁴⁶

The presentation of Euxantius' sentiments in a first-person monologue creates the impression that the singer identifies with his decision. Such sentiments would not be inconceivable on a *θεωρία* to Delos, but they would be more appropriate if the *χορός* were not going to Delos but were performing on Ceos. A *χορός* performing on Delos might have been expected to talk a little more about Delos and Apollo.⁴⁷

We can fill this hypothesis out a little by looking at the proem to *Isthmian* 1, in which Pindar announces that he is putting off composing a song to Delos in order to complete an *Epinikion* for Herodotus of Thebes, although he hopes that he will be able to discharge both duties:

. . . εἶζον, ὠπολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος,
καὶ τὸν ἀκερσεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων
ἐν Κέῳ ἀμφιρύτῃ σὺν ποντίοις
ἀνδράσιν, καὶ τὰν ἀλιερκέα Ἴσθμοῦ
10 δειράδ'.

(. . . Yield, island of Apollo. I will yoke a completion of both favours with the help of the gods, dancing for unshorn Phoebus in Ceos, washed around by the sea, with the sailor men, and for the sea-fenced ridge of the Isthmus.)

Notice that Pindar refers to himself as singing and dancing in honour of Apollo on Ceos, not on Delos. It seems unlikely that this is a rehearsal (as the scholiast suggests)⁴⁸ or a secondary performance in the home country of the *χορός* before they go on the *θεωρία*.⁴⁹ The implication is that the primary performance took place on Ceos. It does not much matter whether *Isthmian* 1 refers to D₄ or some other real song or an imaginary one: what is important is that Pin-

⁴⁶ For Miletus son of Euxantius see above. Euxantius may have been invented to provide a Milesian tribe of the *Εὐξαντίδαι* ('sons of the wool-carders') with a heroic ancestor (K. Tümpel, *RE* xii. 1537). For the Euxantidai see *EM* 394. 33 s.v. *Εὐξάντιδος*. The association between Onites and the Milesian Onitadai (*LSAM* no. 50. 17 ff.; *SIG* 57. 17 ff.) was first made by Huxley (1965), 244. Contrast the explanation of the Onitadai offered by Robertson (1984).

⁴⁷ See Hope (1986); anticipated in Dissen (1830), 524–5, cited by Grandolini (1984–5), 49.

⁴⁸ At *Dr* iii. 198. 14 ff. the scholiast explains the apparent implication of *Isth.* 1. 8 that the performance was at Ceos by the hypothesis that they were rehearsing.

⁴⁹ See p. 64; the performance of this poem is discussed further in Rutherford (2000a).

dar can imagine a song in honour of Delos and Apollo performed on Ceos.

Beyond this, we have to guess. Even if the *χορός* performed the song on Ceos and not Delos, it is still possible that there might have been a connection with a Delian festival. Perhaps Ceian *θεωροί* went on to Delos without the *χορός*. It is also possible that the theoxenic myth of Dexithea and Euxantius had a special connection with the festival.

D5 (*Pa.* V)

str. A [‡] ἰήϊε Δράλι' Ἀπολλων.
[Ἀθηναίοις
εἰς Δῆλον] (lines 2–5 missing)

col. 20
σὺν Χαρίτ[εσσι μολόντα

str. B 7 ἰήϊε Δ,ά,λι' Ἀπολλον.

$$\in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} - \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} - X$$
$$\sigma[-\cup--\cup\cup-\cup\cup--]$$

3

10 K[- - - - -]

[- u u - u u -

 $\lambda \sqrt{-uu-uu--}$

str. C ἰ[ή]ιε Δάλι' Ἀπολλον.

$\tau[-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-x$

15 $\langle - \cup - - - \cup \cup - \cup \cup - - \rangle$

3

$$\pi a \sqrt{\cup \cup - \cup \cup - -}$$
$$\Delta a \lambda \sqrt{\dots}$$

σὺν δ[υο-υο-]

str. D ἰ,ήϊε Δ,άλι' Ἀπολλων.

20 [-vv-vv-x

col. 21 [- ∪ - - - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ἐρίπναι]s

3

(lines 22-32 = str. D. 4-F. 2 missing)

$$[-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup]_a$$

[- u u - u u - -

35 [-uu-uu Ev-

col. 22 βοιαν ἔλον καὶ ἔνασσαν.

- str. G ἰήϊε Δάλι' Ἀπολλων·
καὶ σποράδας φερεμήλους
ἔκτισαν νάσους ἐρικυδέα τ' ἔσχον 3
40 Δᾶλον, ἐπεὶ σφιν Ἀπόλλων
δῶκεν ὁ χρυσοκόμας
— Ἀστερίας δέμας οἰκεῖν·
- str. H ἰήϊε Δάλι' Ἀπολλων·
Χ Λατόος ἔνθα με παῖδες
45 εὐμενεὶ δέξασθε νόω θεράποντα 3
ὑμέτερον κελαδενῶ
σὺν μελιγάρυϊ παι-
— ἄνος ἀγακλέος ὁμφᾶ.

Π⁺ cols. 19–22; lines 6–7: fr. 112 (cf. D'Alessio (1992b))

1–34 Does Σ45 belong somewhere here? See p. 296 6 D'Alessio (1992b) 16 ΠΑ[
ΠΑ[21 From Σ 33 Αἰ 38 πολυμάλους Σ^{ac}; πολυμήλους Σ^{pc}

- Σ 21 (Σ^{δ2}) ἐρίπναις
35 (Σ^{ε1}) [< 20] ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων
38 (Σ^{δ1}) πολυμήλους
45 (Σ^{δ3}) Πάνδωρον Ἐρέχ(θεως) Αἴκλον |
48 (Σ^{δ2}, Σ^{ε1}?) [. . .] [. . .] [. . .] στίρονι

38 η Π^{pc}: πολυμαλούς Π^{ac} 45 Wil: Πανδώρου Π

[MARGINAL TITLE: *For the Athenians to Delos*] *Ieie* Delian Apollo! . . . (arriving) with the Kharites, *Ieie* Delian Apollo! . . . *Ieie* Delian Apollo . . . Delos/Delian . . . *Ieie* Delian Apollo . . . (21) cliffs . . . (35) (they) took Euboea and dwelt there. *Ieie* Delian Apollo! And they made homes in the scattered islands rich in flocks, and held far-famed Delos, since Apollo of the golden locks gave them the body of Asteria to settle. *Ieie* Delian Apollo! There may you, children of Leto, graciously welcome me as your servant, to the resounding, honey-voiced strain of a glorious paean.

(21) Cliffs. (35) From the Athenians. (38) With many flocks. (45) Pandorus, son of Erechtheus; Aiklos.

The song had eight strophes of six lines. The metre is dactylo-epitrite; its simplicity recalls S2, the παιάν to Lysander (*PMG* 856), and some of the Delphic παιάνες. The monostrophic structure perhaps indicates that it was composed to be performed in procession. The refrain, which lacks the Παιάν element, is unique in its position

at the beginning of the strophe. It is almost identical to the *παϊάν*-cry in the parodos of Sophocles' *Oidipous Tyrannos*, 154. In some cases (at lines 37 and 43) it is a parenthesis which leaves undisturbed the grammar of the text on either side of it (as might be expected when the stanzas are so short).¹

The ends of the sixth and seventh stanzas describe the activity of colonists. We see three stages of activity: the first (lines 35–6) is the take-over and settling of Euboea; a marginal scholion tells us that the colonists were *ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων*. Other sources tell us that Aiklos founded Eretria, and Kothos (or Pandoros) the son of Erechtheus founded Chalcis. The names Pandoros and Aiklos appear in a marginal comment at the end of the song (line 45), though the purpose of this comment is mysterious.²

The second stage (lines 38–9, after the refrain) is the settlement of some other islands. These are described as *σποράδες* but are presumably the Cyclades.³ Thucydides says that Ceos, Andros, and Tenos were Athenian foundations, Herodotus says the same of Ceos and Naxos.⁴ The islands are described as 'bearing sheep', one of the uses of which is to be brought to Delos as sacrifices to Apollo (compare G1. 7).⁵

The third stage (lines 39–41) is the taking of Delos, described as the 'body of Asteria'.⁶ One thinks first of historical involvement by Athens in Delos: either in the sixth century BC under Peisistratus or in the fifth in the early stages of the Athenian empire. However, according to a tradition attested only very late, one of the numerous colonies founded by Ion was on Delos, and an Athenian claim to

¹ For the monostrophic structure see pp. 164, 176.

² Athenian colonization of Chalcis and Eretria: Thuc. 7. 57. 4; Strabo 10. 1. 8 gives the names as Aiklos (Eretria) and Kothos (Chalcis); ps.-Skymnos, *Periegesis*, 571 ff. (*GGM* i. 218–19) substitutes Pandoros son of Erechtheus for Kothos. Aiklos and Kothos were also said to be sons of Xouthos: West (1985), 58. Function of Σ 45: below, p. 296.

³ Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 3. 126–7 'sparsasque per aequor | Cycladas'. In later geographers the term usually designates all the Aegean islands except the Cyclades: L. Büchner, *RE* s.v. *Sporades* viA. 1871; contrasted with the Cyclades first (it is unclear with what reference) at Arist. *Mund.* 393^a14. If the name *Σποράδες* was in use for islands other than the Cyclades in the 5th cent. BC and if Pindar is referring to the Cyclades here, the use of the adjective is oxymoronic.

⁴ Thuc. 7. 57. 4; Her. 8. 46; for the original inhabitants of Ceos see p. 289.

⁵ *φερεμήλους* is a hapax. The variant *πολυμάλους* (with *πολυμήλους* superscribed) reported in Σ could have been inspired by *Ol.* 1. 12. For possession of sheep as a topos of praise see Kienzie (1936), 45–6.

⁶ Asteria is named only here in Pindar; the story of her flight is presupposed: see p. 250 on C2. 42 ff.

Delos is also reflected in the mythical involvement there of Theseus and Erysichthon. On the level of myth, the idea of establishing a colony on Delos seems to reflect the role of Apollo Archegetes of Delos in directing colonization.⁷

The last stanza is a prayer to Apollo and Artemis (Λατοῖς . . . παῖδες), who are asked to receive their *θεράπων* accompanied by the sound of the *παῖάν*. The *θεράπων* could be either the singer (perhaps a member of the *χορός*) or the poet; on grounds of genre I would prefer the former.⁸ The form of the prayer is standard: in particular, the reference to the kindly mind (*εὐμενεῖ* . . . νόῳ) with which the deities are to receive the performance can be paralleled in other *παῖάνες*.⁹ The impression of closure is not strong because requests to deities to receive the singer can come not just at the end of a song but also at the start (see e.g. D6. 1). I wonder whether the purpose of having a comparatively unemphatic ending was to enable the *χορός* smoothly to sing the song over again from the beginning, as might have been required if they were performing it while processing along the Sacred Way from the harbour at Delos to the sanctuary.

A serious problem is posed by the scholiast's reference to Pan-doros and Aiklos in the closing prayer. GH thought that this scholion might be a lost line from earlier in the song.¹⁰ More reasonably, Wilamowitz suggested that the scholiast may have glossed *θεράποντα* with their names, in the belief that the last stanza was part of a speech spoken by the original colonists (rather like the section of D4 where a Ceian singer identifies himself with his mythical ancestor). Perhaps the scholiast believed that the whole song was a sort of re-enactment of original colonization.¹¹

On the basis of his interpretation of the scholion, Wilamowitz

⁷ Vell. Pat. 1. 4. 3. Myths influenced by Peisistratus: van Schoeffler (1889), 9 ff. Apollo and colonization: pp. 166, 386.

⁸ Similar expressions are found at fr. 94c 3 *ἀγοίς*, ὦ κλυτά, *θεράποντα*, *Λατοῖ* ('May you lead, o famous Leto, your servant'), and *Ol.* 3. 16 *δάμον Ὑπερβορέων* . . . *Ἀπόλλωνος θεράποντα* ('the *δήμος* of the Hyperboreans . . . the servant of Apollo'). The image of the poet as 'servant of the Muses' is found also in Bacchylides (5. 14, 192; fr. 63. 1). See West (1964), 100; Falter (1934), 74 ff.; Nagy (1979), 295 ff., 304 ff.

⁹ Comparable are *Pyth.* 8. 18 ff.; Sim. *PMG* 519 fr. 35(b). 4; Macedonicus, *παῖάν*, line 2 (with Pordomingo Pardo (1984)). Such idioms in Greek poetry are discussed by Shorey (1910).

¹⁰ GH 93, arguing that this might be the line that Π⁴ omits in the third strophe.

¹¹ Wilamowitz (1922), 327–8. For the *μίμησις* of myth in ritual see p. 175.

proposed that the χορός were from Euboea, perhaps from Eretria; confusion between performers and mythical forebears is more intelligible if they come from the same place. We know that at least one Euboean χορός performed at Delos in the fifth century BC, since it was in this century that the ἀλλητῆς Pronomus, son of Oeniades, composed a *προσόδιον* for the Chalcidians on the Euripus for performance at Delos.¹² But Wilamowitz's argument is also compatible with the hypothesis that the performers were Athenian. And, all things considered, the story of Ionian migration is most likely to have been performed at Delos by Athenians.¹³ This could have been an important song sung on a state *θεωρία* to Delos, consolidating Athenian control of the Aegean by recalling the Ionian migration.

About the festival, we can only guess. Athenian *Deliastai* may have been going to Delos since as early as the time of Solon.¹⁴ We know that many *θεωρίαι* left Attica for Delos, the starting-point generally being Prasiai on the west coast of Attica.¹⁵ We know of perhaps five distinct series. (1) Thucydides says that at some point in the past the Ionians had all gone to the festival on Delos, but more recently it had only been the islanders and the Athenians. Presumably Ionian involvement ended with the Ionian revolt. We do not know how often this festival took place.¹⁶ (2) We know that the Athenians sent a ship every year to Delos commemorating the exploits of Theseus, perhaps coinciding with the Delian festival of Apollo in the month of Hieros (=Attic Anthesterion). (We know that the Athenians believed that this had been a continuous tradition since the event itself.)¹⁷ One possibility is that this was originally part of the Ionian festival, which continued after

¹² Paus. 9. 12. 5 = *PMG* 767; see H. v. Geisau, *RE* s.v. *Pronomus*, xlv. 748.

¹³ Farnell (1930), ii. 400, argues for Athens on the grounds that 'as Athens was unpopular in the island after the Persian invasion, it is not likely that Pindar would have referred to her thus, if he had been commissioned by some Euboean state'. But our knowledge of Euboean history in the 5th cent. BC is inadequate to justify this assertion.

¹⁴ Polemo *Periegetes*, fr. 78 Preller (=Athen. 234 C), citing the *κύρβεις* of Solon (Stroud (1979), 4-5); Harpocration, s.v. *Δηλιασταί*, says that the orator Lycurgus mentioned the Attic *Δηλιασταί* (=fr. 89 Blass).

¹⁵ Delmoussou (1988) suggests that at an earlier point Brauron might have been a starting-point for a festival during the time of Peisistratus.

¹⁶ Thuc. 3. 104; the best discussion of Thucydides' testimony is Highby (1936), 11-13; see Hornblower (1982). Frequency: van Schoeffel (1889), 41, believes that the earlier festival was annual, as does Mommsen (1907).

¹⁷ Plato, *Phaedo*, 58 A-C; Plut. *Theseus*, 23. 1; Call. *Hy.* 4. 314-15; Bruneau (1970), 19 ff.

Ionian involvement ceased. However, it may also have been independent. (3) The most celebrated was the penteteric *θεωρία* sent by the Athenians to Delos, but this seems to date only from the time of the second purification of Delos in 426 BC; the famous Athenian *θεωρία* to Delos led by Nicias probably happened after the second purification.¹⁸ (4) A distinct *θεωρία* seems to have been sent to Delos from the Tetrapolis of Marathon.¹⁹ (5) The *Athenaion Politeia* also mentions a heptaeteric *θεωρία* to Delos, but this is not mentioned anywhere else, and we have to reckon with the possibility that there may have been a textual corruption.²⁰

Of these series, (1) and (2), which may be part of the same thing, are likely candidates for the performance of D5. Another possibility is (4), the *θεωρία* from the Tetrapolis—a special point in favour of which might be the strong ties between the Tetrapolis and the traditions of the Ionians, which would suit the Ionic emphasis of the song.²¹ It is also possible that the song was performed in some special context not tied to a regular festival, e.g. to avert the effects of a plague.

What might have been contained in the earlier stages of the song? An Athenian singer/χορός might have wanted to lay claim to other Athenian colonies also, perhaps some in Ionia. Other themes suitable for an Athenian song performed on Delos might have been Theseus' founding of the festival (cf. Bacch. 17); perhaps also the story of Athena Pronoia's involvement in the birth of Apollo (cf. G1. 8).²²

D6 (*Pa.* VI)

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| str. A ‡
Δελφοῖς
εἰς Πυθῶ | Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς σε, χρυσέεα
κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ- |
|------------------------------------|--|

¹⁸ Thuc. 3. 104. 4 is the source for this. For the penteteric *θεωρία* see Pollux, *Onom.* 8. 107; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54. 7, with Rhodes (1981), 606–7; also *Ath. Pol.* 56. 3 with Rhodes (1981), 626. *θεωρία* of Nicias: Plut. *Nicias*, 3. 4.

¹⁹ Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 75 (=ΣSoph. *OC* 1047); Boethius (1918), 38 ff.; Toepffer (1888). ²⁰ *Ath. Pol.* 54. 7 with Rhodes (1981), 607.

²¹ Strabo, 8. 7. 1 (drawing on Ephorus?) says that Xouthos founded the Tetrapolis.

²² We know from Σ that at line 21 a word very like *ἐρίπναι* occurred in the text; might these perhaps have been the cliffs of Mount Cynthus from which Zeus observed the birth of Apollo?

- col. 23 σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτῃ
 5 ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ 3
 χ αἰοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν·
 μ^c χ ὕδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
 ψόφον αἰῶν Κασταλίας
 ὀρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον 6
 χ ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ[λ]έξων
 11 τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς·
 ἥτορι δὲ φίλῳ παῖς ἄτε ματέρι κεδνᾷ
 πειθόμενος κατέβαν
 στεφάνων καὶ θαλιᾶν τροφὸν ἄλσος Ἀπόλλωνος, 9
 15 τόθι Λατοῖδαν
 θαμινὰ Δελφῶν κόραι
 χθονὸς ὀμφαλὸν παρὰ σκιάεντα μελπ[ό]μεναι
 ποδὶ κροτέο[ντι γᾶν θο]ῶ

(lines 19-49 = str. A. 19-21, ant. A, ep. A. 1-7 missing)

ep. A

- col. 26 50 καὶ πόθεν ἀθάν[ατος πόνος ἄ]ρξατο.
 χ ταῦτα θεοῖσι [μ]έν
 52-3 χ πιθεῖν σοφοῦ[s] δυνατόν, | βροτοῖσιν δ'
 ἀμάχανον 9
 εὐρέμεν· ἀλλά—παρθένοι γάρ, ἴσατ[ε], Μο[ι]σαι,
 55 πάντα· κε[λ]αι[ν]εφεί σὺν
 πατρὶ Μναμοσ[ύν]α τε
 τοῦτον ἔσχετ[ε τεθ]μόν—
 κλύτε νῦν· ἔρα[ται] δέ μοι[ι] 12
 > γλώσσα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν [υ υ υ υ υ]
 μ^c 60 ἀγῶνα Λοξία καταβάντ' εὐρὺν
 — ἐν θεῶν ξενία.
 str. B θύεται γὰρ ἀγλαῆς ὑπὲρ Πανελ-
 λάδος, ἄν τε Δελφῶν
 ἔθ[ν]ος εὗξατο λι-
 col. 27 65 μοῦ θ[υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ]
 ἐκδι[υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ]
 φιλει[υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ]
 Κρόν[ι υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ]

- πρυτὰ[νι· -- -- --
 70 τοὶ πα[· -- -- -- -- 6
 χρησ[τ]η[ρι· -- -- -- --
 Πυ]θωνόθ[εν -- --
 καί ποτε [· -- -- -- -- --
 Πανθοο[· -- -- --
 75 δ' ἐς Τροίᾱ[ν -- -- -- --] ἦνεγκε[ν 9
 θρασυμή-]
 δεα πάϊς [· -- --
 -- -- --] ον ἐμβα[λ- -- -- -- --
 Πάριος ἐ[καβόλος βροτη-
 col. 28 80 σίῳ δέμαϊ θεός,
 Ἰλίῳ δὲ θῆκεν ἄφαρ 12
 --- ὀψιτέραν ἄλωσιν,
 ant. B κυανοπλόκοιο παιῖδα ποντίας
 Θέτιος βιατάν,
 85 πιστὸν ἔρκος Ἀχαι-
 ῶν, θρασεῖ φόνῳ πεδάσαιο·
 χ ὅσσα τ' ἔριξε λευκωλένῳ 3
 ἄκναμπτον Ἥρα μένος ἀν[τ]ερείδων
 ὅσα τε Πολιάδι. πρὸ πόνων
 90 δέ κε μεγάλων Δαρδανίαν
 ἔπραθεν, εἰ μὴ φύλασεν Ἀπό[λ]λ[ω]ν· 6
 νέφεσσι δ' ἐν χρυσέοις Ὀλύμπιοι-
 ο καὶ κορυφα[ῖσι]ν ἰζων
 μόρσιμ' ἀνα[λ]ύεν Ζεὺς ὁ θεῶν σκοπὸς οὐ τόλ-
 col. 29 95 μα· περὶ δ' ὑψικόμῳ
 [Ἐ]λένα χρῆν ἄρα Πέργαμον εὐρύ[ν] ἀῖστωσαι 9
 σέλας αἰθομένου
 πυρός· ἐπεὶ δ' ἄλκιμον
 νέκυν [έ]ν τά[φω] πολυστόνῳ θέντο Πηλεΐδαν,
 100 ἀλὸς ἐπὶ κύμα βάντες [ῆ]λ-
 θον ἄγγελο[ι] ὀπίσω
 Σκυρόθεν Ν[ε]οπτόλεμο[ν] 12
 --- εὐρυβίαν ἄγοντες
 ep. B ὃς διέπερσεν Ἰλίου πόλιν·

- 105 ἀλλ' οὔτε ματέρ' ἔπειτα κεδνὰν
 εἶδεν οὔτε πατρῷαις ἐν ἀρου[ραις] 3
 ἵππους Μυρμιδόνων,
 ν χαλκοκορυ[στ]ὰν [ὄ]μιλον ἐγε[ί]ρων.
 χ σχεδὸν δ[ὲ] Το]μάρου Μολοσσίδα γαῖαν 6
 110 ἐξίκετ' οὐδ' [ἀ]νέμους ἔ[λ]α[θ]εν
 col. 30 οὐδὲ τὸν [ε]ὔρυφαρέτραν ἑκαβόλον·
 ὦ[μο]σε [γὰρ θ]εός,
 113-14 γέ[ρον]θ' ὅ[τι] Πρίαμον | π[ρ]ὸς ἐρκεῖον ἦναρε 9
 115 βωμὸν ἐ[πεν]θορόντα, μὴ νιν εὐφρον' ἐς οἴ[κ]ον
 μ]ήτ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἰξέ-
 μεν βίου· ἀμφιπόλοις δέ
 μ₁υρ₁ι₁ᾱ₁ν₁ περὶ τιμᾶν
 δηρι]αζόμενον κτάνεν 12
 120 εἰ₁ν₁ τεμέ]νεϊ φίλω γᾶς παρ' ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύν.
 <ἦ> ἰῆτε₁ νῦν, μέτρα παιηό-
 ν]ων ἰῆτε₁ νέοι₁.
 str. C † ὀνομακλύτα γάρ ἐσσι Δωριεῖ
]Αιγ[ινῆτα]ς μ[ε]δέοισα [πό]ντω
 εἰ]ς Αἰα[κά]ν νᾶσος, [ὦ] Διὸς Ἑλ-
]προσ[ύ]διον |
 col. 31 126 λανίου φαεννὸν ἄστρον.
 οὔνεκεν οὐ σε παιηόνων 3
 ἄδορπον εὐνάξομεν, ἀλλ' αἰοιδᾶν
 ῥόθια δεκομένα κατερεῖς
 130 πόθεν ἔλαβες ναυπρύτανιν
 δαίμονα καὶ τὰν θεμίζενον ἀρετ[άν]. 6
 ὁ πάντα τοι τά τε καὶ τὰ τεύχων
 σὸν ἐγγυάλιξεν ὄλβον
 εὐρύο[πα] Κρόνου παῖς. ὑδάτ(εσσ)ι δ' ἐπ' Ἀσ[ω]-
 135 ποῦ π[οτ'] ἀ]πὸ προθύρων
 βαθύκολποῦ ἀγερέψατο παρθένον Αἰγιναν· 9
 > τότε χρύσει α-
 > ἔρος ἔκρυψαν κόμ[α]ι
 ἐπιχώριον κατάσκιον νῶτον ὑμέτερον,
 > ἵνα λεχέων ἐπ' ἀμβρότων
 col. 32 141 φ[υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-]

- αισ[υ-υ-υ-υ]αι 12
 — Μυρ[μιο-υ-υ-
 ant. c τὸν[υ-υ-υ-υ σωφρο]νέστατον
 145 Διὸς [υ-υ-υ-
 πεύ[υ-υ-υ-
 πῶ[υ-υ-υ-υ-]ον
 πᾶ[υ-υ-υ-υ-]ων· 3
 ξε[υ-υ-υ-υ-]έμμεν ἀλίω
 150 κυ[υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-]υ δε-
 ξᾶ[υ-υ-υ-υ-]τίᾱ
 νο[υ-υ-υ-]εμον . . ναιδων· 6
 τρ[×-υ-υ-υ-]νοῖον ᾧ σοί
 σε [-υ-υ-υ-]οῦν οἷ
 155 Ζῆ[υ-υ-υ-υ-] πρὶν Στυγὸς ὄρκιον ἐξ εὖ-
 col. 33 [-υ-υ-υ-υ-]δικάσαι
 (lines 157-68=ant. c. 14-21, ep. c. 1-4 missing)
 ep. c
 -υ-υ-υ-]αροῖ[
 170 υ-υ-υ-υ-]κλυτὰς ἴδω ι[- 6
 -υ-υ-υ-υ- χα]λκοχάρμαι
 col. 34 ιποιναῖ υ-υ-υ-]δᾶ κεχολωμένος
 -υ-υ-υ-υ-]ωι
 174-5 υ-υ-υ-]ξ[υ-υ-]εσ[| υ-υ-]ι μυρία[]όγοι 9
 τῶν γε δο[ρικτ]ύπων[. . .]εἰν ἀπείρονας ἀρετὰς
 Αἰακ]ιδᾶν· φ[ιλεῖ]τε
 . . .]ι πόλιν πατρίαν, φί-
 λεῖτε] δ' εὖφ[ρον]α λαὸν
 180 τόνδε καὶ ιστεφάνοισι ινι, 12
 πανθαλέος ὕγιε[ίας] σκιάζετε· Μοισᾶν
 ἐπαβολέοντ[α] πολλάκι, Παιάν, δέ-
 ξ[] ἐννόμων ἐ[νοπ]ᾶν.

The main source is Π⁴, with some contributions from Π⁵ and Π⁷: Π⁴ cols. 22-34; Π⁵ fr. I' + II' (page 29?) = lines 61-70; fr. I' + II' (page 30?) = lines 104-111; fr. III' + XII' + XI' + IV' + V' + VI' (page 31?) = lines 125-56; fr. III' + XII' + XI' + IV' + V' + VI' (page 32?) = lines 168-83; Π⁷ fr. 15 (Lobel (1961), 17) = lines 128-31; Π⁷ fr. 16 = lines 134-6. Lines 1-6 are cited by Ael. Ar. Or. 28. 58 (Περὶ τοῦ παραφθέγματος), 117 ff.;

ΣPind. *Nem.* 7. 64 (Dr iii. 129. 5 ff.), 123 ff.; ΣHom. *Il.* 22. 51 (v. 274 Erbse). Lines 73 ff. may be alluded to in ΣHom. *Il.* 19. 326 (see below, n. 24)

3 ἄ(ι)σομαι Ael. Ar. 6 Πⁱ: ἀσιδύμων Π^a Πιερίων Ael. Ar. 8 Wil (1908), (1922):
 ἄτων GH 10 ἑΤΑΙΣ Π Α[.]ΕΞΩΝ Πⁱ; -[P]H- Π^a; ΑΕΞΩΝ Σ 14 κλυτὸν ἄλσος Σ
 17 Housman (1908): CKIOENTA Π 18 κροτεῦ Π] J 50 Rutherford:
 ἄθαν[άτοις ἔρις Bury ap. GH; ἄθαν[άτων ἔρις Diehl (1917) (cf. Wüst (1967)); ἄθάν[ατων
 γέρας Sitzler (1911c); ἄθαν[άτων πόνος Poland (1921); ἄθαν[άτων ξένια Ferrari (1992a)
 52 πιθεῖν Πⁱ, Σ (πⁱ): πεῖθειν Π^a 54 ἱσ[σ]ατ[ε] Ferrari (1992b): ἱσθ' ὅτ[ι] Jurenka
 (1913) 57 κόσιμον Slater (1969a) 59 καταλείβειν Wil (1908); καταχεύει
 Kamberbeek ap. Radt 60 ΛΟΞΙΑΙ Π, defended by Radt, Slater (1969a): Λοξία GH
 65 θ[ύειν Sn 66 ἐκδ[Π^a; ΕΚΔΙ, Π^a 67 φιλεῖ γάρ Sn 68 Κρόν]ιε GH
 βαρύοπα στεροπᾶν suppl. Tosi (1908) 69 πυρτα[νι Diehl (1917) 71-2 GH:
 Πν-]θωνόβ Π, with different colometry from that of corresponding points; but notice
 that in lines 92-3 the scribe seems initially to have followed the same alternative
 colometry, correcting himself by adding O at the start of line 93 73 ff. καί
 ποτε [Πράμιυ Φοιβος ὅπασεν ἄρωγόν] | Πάνθοο[ν, Ἀλκαιδᾶν ὅτε παϊ-]δες Τρωῖας ἔδος
 ἔπραθον] Tosi (1908) 76 Housman (1908) 77 Λεερτίον or Νηλέως Sn
 78] ὄν GH ἐμβα[λάν ἰὸν GH, then e.g. ἀφάνισεν 79 Ἐ[81 Πⁱ: ΙΑΙΟΥ
 Π^a 83 κυανοκόμοιο Σ 84 Π^{ac}: Θέτιδος Π^{ac} 88 ἄκαμπτον Schr (1923)
 ἌΝ[]Ε (i.e. ἀν[τ]ερεῖδων) Π^{ac}: ἌΝ[]Ε (i.e. ἀν[τ]') ἐρεῖδων) Π^{ac} 89 ὅσσα Aristot-
 phanes or Aristonikos (see Σ) 91 Π^a: ἔπραθον Bury ap. GH 92 GH: νεφεσι
 Π^a 93 ΟΛΥΜΠΟΙ[]Ο Π^{ac}: presumably ΟΛΥΜΠΟΙΟ Π^{ac} (final O is not visible) 94-
 5 τολμᾶ Wil 95 ὑψικόμοι[]'Ε]λέας Maas (1913-21) 96-7 εὐρὺν ἀ-]ιστώσει
 Schr (1908) 97 GH: -ΜΕΝΟC Π 99 Πηλεΐδα GH 108 -κορυ[στ]ᾶν GH:
 -κορυ[στ]ᾶν Rihezw (1921) ΛΟΝ or ΛΕΝ GH: ἐ[φ]υ[γ]εν Mulbegaat-Holler (1927)
 110 ἐ[λ]α[φ]θ[εν GH: ἐ[φ]υ[γ]εν Wil;][The ' seems to be a mistake, though note
 that the metrical pattern here depends on Π^a (at line 171), which might have a dif-
 ferent colometry 111 ἘΤΡᾶΝ 112 γάρ Housman (1908) 113 suppl.
 Sn 115 ΝΙΝ Π^a: ΜΙΝ Πⁱ οὐ[κ]ον Housman (1908) 117 ἀμφιπόλοισ δὲ Π:
 ἀμφιπόλοισι Σ*Nem.* 7. 64 (Dr iii. 129. 5 ff.) 118 μυριάων, Verrall (1908):]υρ[. . .]
 Π; Πυθιᾶν ΣΠ^a; μυριάν περὶ τιμᾶν Σ*Nem.* 7. 64 cod. B, μυριάν περὶ τιμᾶν cod. D (Dr
 iii. 129. 5 ff.); κ]υρ[ι]ᾶν, Housman (1908); μοιριάν Boeckh (1821), μοιρίαν Schneider
 (1776) 119 GH from Σκτανεμεν: κτανεῦ Π; κτανέν also Σ 123 subtitle (previ-
 ously interpreted as Σ to 108) Αἰγ[ιν]ήτα]is Diehl (1917), the rest Rutherford (1907b)
 Followed by 3 deleted lines 123 γάρ ἔσαι Rutherford: γάρ ἔστι ΣHom., γ' ἔνεσαι
 GH 133 -λιξον Π^aΠ^a 134 GH: υδατι Π^aΠ^a 136 Maas (1913-21):
]ΕΡΕΨ Π^a;]ΕΨ Π^a; ἀναρέψ- GH; ἀνᾶρεψ- Koster (1953) 138 GH: εκρυψαταν Π^a
 139 ἀμέτερον Calder (1977) 143 Μυρ[μυδόνες Wil; Μυρ[μυδόνων ἀνακτα ἀριστον
 Sn 148]ΩΝ: 150 κυ[αν]εο Sn 151]Τ or]Γ ΑΙ 152 νό[σ]τοι
 Turyn 154 Sn: 'ΟΙ 155-6 ἐξ εὐ[]νοι' ὁμόσαντα φρενός Sn 171 Vitelli
 (1913) 172 Σ 173]ΩΙ,]CΟΙ,]ΕΟΙ 174]'ΕC rather than]ΕC 175-
 6 Colometry follows Π^a; ΜΥΡΙΑ[...]ΟΓΟΙΤΩΝ Π^a (so read by Vitelli (1913), Radt);
 λυρ[ι]ᾶν μυριάων φλ[όγ] δ' ἰπών τε Sn 176 ΓΕ Π^a: ΤΕ Π^a δο[ρυκτ]ύπων Ferrari (1988)
 κλέ]ειν Radt; λέγ]ειν D'Alessio (1988b) 177 Αἰακ]ιδᾶν Turyn 178 Sn
 . . . πατρ[ω] . . .]ν πολων Π^a (i.e. inverted order);]ρωϊαν φι-] Π^a 180 D'Alessio
 (1988b) (στεφά]νοισι from Σ);]νοισι παν Π^a νν Π^a: omitted by Π^a, perhaps also by Π^a
 181 παν Π^a, θαλέος Π^a, πανθαλέος D'Alessio (1988b): πάν GH; παν] εὐ]θαλέος Vitelli
 (1913) 182 (at start of line) δ' Sn; σφ' Hoekstra (1962) ἐπαβολέοντ[α] Ferrari
 (1988) (from Π^a): -λέοντ[α] Sn Παιάν Π^a 183 ἐ[νο]π]ᾶν Ferrari (1988): Ε, Θ Π^a,
]ᾶν Π^a; θ[αλ]ῖαν or θ[υσ]ῖαν Sn; ἐ[υ]ᾶν Puech (1952); alternatively θ[αλ]ῖαν, θ[υσ]ῖαν?

Σ 7 (left margin) Μ (i.e. 1,200)

7a (Σ^{ε1}) ἐπεὶ διὰ χαλκῶν λεοντοχα[σμά] | τῶν ῥεῖ εἰς αὐτ(ήν) ὁ Κηφισός[< 5]

7b (Σ^{ε1}) τὸν ἐπὶ τῷ χαλκοπύλῳ [ῥ]δατ[ι] | ψόφον

10 (Σ^{δ2}) ἀέξων

11 (Σ^{ε2}) κατὰ κοιν[ο]ῦ ἐμαῖς τιμ(αῖς). ἔλεξεν μέντ(οι) ἵνα δηλονότι ἐντμος ὦ

14 (Σ^{δ2}) κλυτὸν ἄλσος

37 (Σ^ε [~?] τὰς θεὰς | [~?]. εἰς ἅπαν | [~?] τῆς θεὰς ἔπος

43 (Σ^{ε1}) [~?] ν | [~?] ρονω | [~?] αῖν |

48 (Σ^ε [~?] ἔσχον |

52 (Σ^{δ2}) πι[θεῖν < 3]

55 (Σ^{δ1}) [ζ]η(τεῖται) [μ]ελα[ινεφεῖ]

59a (Σ^{δ1}) ζ(ητεῖται) ἀ[ωτ]ορ[ι] .[. . . .]

59b (Σ^{δ2}) ἀν(τι τοῦ) ἁώτου

62 (Σ^{ε1}) [< 15] .[. . .] ητ. τήν Ἑλλάδα | [< 20] περὶ εἰ[ς] ἐτηρί-
ας | [< 20] αῖν, ἄς καὶ μέχρι | [< 15] ἐκάστ[ο]ν ἔτους | [~?]

74]εἰ |

83 (Σ^{δ1}) κυα[ν]οκόμοιο

87 (Σ^{δ2}) ἄόριστος το(ῦ) ἐρίζω

89 (Σ^{δ1}) Ἀρ(ιστό)νι(κος) ὄσσα

108 (left margin) Ν (i.e. 1,300)

118a (Σ^{δ1}) ζ(ητεῖται) Πυθιάν

118b (Σ^{ε1}) ἦτοι τῶν κ[ρ]εῶν ἃ διαρπαζόντων συνήθως τῶν Ἀ[ε]λφ[ω]ν ἐδυσχέ-
ραινε καὶ ἐκώλυε, διὸ καὶ ἀνήρηται ἡ τῶν χρημάτων ἃ διαρπάζων εἰς ἐκδικίαν
τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνῆρέθη

119 (Σ^{δ2}) ζ(ητεῖται) κτάνεν ἐν γρ(άφεται) [κταν]έν

121 (Σ^{δ2}) γρ(άφεται) ιηητε

122 (Σ^{δ2}) Νι(κάνωρ) [ἰ]ή ἢ τε νέοι

124 (Σ^{δ2}) ἐν τῷ ᾧ [τῷ]ν προσοδι[ω]ν φέρεται

125 (Σ^{δ1}) ἱερὸν Διὸς Ἑλ[λ]ηνίου [ἐ]ν Αἰ[γ]ῶνι ὅπου συνελθόντες .[~?] |
εὐξ[α]ν[το] περὶ τοῦ αὐχμοῦ

129 (Σ^{δ2}, ^{ε1}?) ὁδε[< 18]

130 (Σ^{ε1}) ητ[~18] ην | απ[~18] ν τινες | .[~18] στινα |
[~17] λοποiei.

134 (Σ^{ε2}) [< 11] ατριβου | [< 11] θυρων ἐλ | [< 11] ο

139 τ[< 25]

172 (Σ^{δ1}) πόινᾶ |

175 (Σ^{ε2}) προστακτικῶς |

180 (Σ^{ε1}) στεφάνοισί νιν |

181a (Σ^{δ2}) Ἀρ(ιστό)νι(κος) κ[< 18]

181b (Σ^δ) οἰτ[< 18]

183a (Σ^{ε2}) τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν[δ]ίκων

183b (Σ^{δ2}) ζ(ητεῖται) εἰλιομαν

ἔθυσαν ἄς καὶ μεχρὶ [γὺν θύουσιν] ἐκάστου ἔτους Sn 89 McNamee (1977): Ἀ(ριστο-
 φάν)ης) ὅσσα GH, Radt, Slater (fr. 384c) 119 κτάνεν ἐν GH: κτανεμεν Π
 124 Fr. 108 situated by D'Alessio and Rutherford (see Rutherford (1997b)) ἐν
 τῷ π[όν]τῳ π[ρότερο]ν φ. Diehl (1917); ἐν τῷ π[όν]τῳ π[ρωτείο]ν φ. Sn; Radt doubts
 π[όν]τῳ 125 ο[ἰ] 'Ἑλλήνες Sn 130 εἰδωλοποιεῖ GH 134 τὴν Αἴγιναν
 δι' αὐτῆς βου[σαν ἐπὶ τῶν προ]θύρων ἐλ[θὼν ἀπεσπάσατ]ο GH 181a McNamee
 (1977); cf. Slater (1986), fr. 384d 183b i.e. ἐννομᾶν? Sn

TRIAD A. [MARGINAL TITLE: *For the Delphians to Pytho*] Golden Pytho, famed for seers, I beseech you, by Olympian Zeus, with the Kharites and Aphrodite, welcome me, the interpreter of the Pierides, famed in song, at the sacred time. For at the water of Castalia with its gate of bronze hearing its sound bereft of the dancing of men, I have come to ward off helplessness from your townsmen and my privileges. Obeying my own heart as a child obeys its dear mother, I have come to Apollo's grove which nurtures garlands and banquets, where beside the earth's shadowy navel the girls of Delphi singing the son of Leto often beat the ground with quick foot . . . (*Epode*) . . . And as to the source of the immortal labour, the gods are able to persuade the wise of this but mortal men cannot find it. But—since, virgin Muses, you know all things: you possess this prerogative, along with the dark-clouded father and Mnemosyne—listen now! For my tongue desires (to sing) a song of honey-sweet perfection now that I have come to the broad gathering of Loxias on the occasion of the guest-festival of the gods.

TRIAD B. The sacrifice is being offered on behalf of all of glorious Greece, which the tribe of the Delphians prayed (to save from) the famine . . . unjust . . . likes . . . son of Cronos . . . lord . . . who . . . oracles . . . from Pytho . . . And once . . . Panthoos . . . and to Troy . . . a child brought . . . bold-hearted . . . he shot . . . the far-shooting god in the mortal body of Paris and at once postponed the capture of Ilium, binding in bold slaughter the violent child of the dark-haired sea-goddess Thetis, the trusted bastion of the Achaeans. What strife he waged with white-armed Hera in matching against her his unflinching spirit, what strife with Athena, the guardian of the city! Before great labours he would have sacked the Dardan city, had Apollo not been on guard. But Zeus, scout of the gods, sitting in golden clouds and on the peaks of Olympus, did not dare wind back fate. Around Helen of the high hair it was ordained that a blaze of burning fire should make broad Pergamum invisible. When they had laid the mighty corpse, the son of Peleus, in the much-mourned grave, messengers who had gone over the wave of the sea returned bringing Neoptolemus from Scyros, Neoptolemus broad in force, who sacked the city of Ilium. But he never saw his dear mother again, nor the horses of the Myrmidons on his ancestral plains, urging on the bronze-helmeted throng. Near Mount Tomarus he came, to the Molossian land, and escaped neither the winds nor the far-shooter with his broad quiver. For the god had sworn that

because he had killed aged Priam as he leapt towards the altar of Zeus Herkeios, he would reach neither his kindly home nor old age in life. As he quarrelled with the attendants over vast prerogatives Apollo slew him in his own sanctuary by earth's broad navel. *Ie*, sing *ie* now—measures of paeans—sing *ie*, young men.

TRIAD C. [MARGINAL (?SUB)TITLE: *For the Aeginetans in honour of Aiakos a prosodion*] You are famous in name, island ruling the Dorian sea, O bright star of Zeus Hellanios. For that reason we shall not lay you to rest without a feast of paeans, but you will receive waves of song and declare from where you received ship-guiding fortune and virtue consisting in justice to guests. The wide-seeing son of Cronus who does everything, both this and that, bestowed your wealth on you, and once on the waters of the Asopus ravished the deep-breasted virgin Aegina from her doorstep. Then it was that golden tresses of vapour covered your native back in shadow, so that on an immortal couch . . . Myrmidons . . . the . . . most temperate of Zeus . . . marine . . . which to you . . . Zeus . . . before the Stygian oath . . . I see famous . . . of bronze battle . . . retribution . . . angered . . . spear-clashing measureless virtues of the Aiakidai . . . love your native city, love this kind people, and cover them with garlands of all-blooming health. Receive, Paian, one who frequently possesses the harmonious strains of the Muses.

(7a) Since the Cephissus flows into it through bronze lion-head spouts. (7b) The sound at the bronze-gated water. (10) Increasing. (11) For my honour by the common construction (i.e. ἀπὸ κοινοῦ); he said, 'so that I am clearly honoured'. (14) Famous grove. (37) The goddesses . . . to every utterance of the goddess. (48) They possessed. (55) Problem: black-clouded. (59a) Problem: the flower . . . (59b) Instead of 'of the flower'. (62) . . . Greece . . . for a good year . . . which even until . . . each year. (83) With dark hair. (87) Aorist of ἐρίζω. (89) Aristonicus: ὄσσα. (118a) Problem: Pythian. (118b) Either it refers to the meat, which he angrily tried to prevent the Delphians from seizing in their usual manner, as a result of which he was killed; or else it refers to the money which he was trying to seize in recompense for his father, and for which he was killed. (119) Problem: κράνεν ἐν; alternatively: [κραν]έν. (121) Alternatively: ἡγήρε. (122) Ni(kanor): *ie* and *ie*, young men. (124) It circulates in book 1 of the *Prosodia*. (125) The temple of Zeus Hellenios in Aegina where, coming together, they prayed concerning the drought. (172) Punishment. (175) As an imperative. (180) With crowns him. (181a) Aristonicus . . . (183a) Those from the lawful. (183b) Problem: εἰλομαν (?)

The best-preserved of the *Paians* has always been the most problematic, not least because of the issue of its relationship to *Nemean* 7 (see below). A new range of problems has now been added by the discovery that the text of the song is equipped with not one but two marginal titles, one at the start (*For the Delphians in honour of Pytho*) and a second at the start of the third triad (*For the Aeginetans in honour of Aiakos a prosodion*). In addition, a scholion beside the opening of the third triad seems to indicate that this triad

was transmitted independently as a *Prosodion*. I shall address these issues below.

The song opens with a prayer by the singer addressed to Delphi, using the more poetic name 'Pytho'. He asks in the name of Zeus that she receive him at the sacred time of the Theoxenia, including the Kharites and Aphrodite with himself in the prayer. There is no reference to Apollo, whom one would expect to be mentioned in the introduction of a *παιάν*.¹ 'Beginning with Zeus' is a traditional pattern,² but it has special point in this song because Zeus seems to have played a part in the aetiology of the Delphic Theoxenia (line 68), and because Zeus Hellanios was the patron of Aegina (line 125). The inclusion of the Kharites and Aphrodite in the prayer identifies the register as one of sexuality and celebration: it is as if the *χορός* of young men (line 122) is a *κῶμος* arriving at Delphi.³ The speaking subject's description of himself as *δοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν* (line 6)—an example of a common analogy between song and prophecy in Greek poetry—perhaps has the secondary rhetorical function of making Pytho well disposed towards the approaching singer.⁴

The prayer continues with an explanation for the singer's arrival. He describes the circumstances: he heard the sound of Castalia at the water with the bronze gate bereft of the dancing of men, which seems to be a periphrastic expression for the thought that he realized that Delphi needed a chorus⁵ (the reference to water perhaps suggests poetic inspiration).⁶ Then he specifies a dual purpose for

¹ For introductory formulae see p. 74.

² So the rhapsodes begin with a proem to Zeus (*Nem.* 2. 1 ff.), and the Muses began with Zeus when they sang at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (*Nem.* 5. 25 ff.); cf. also Alcman *PMG* 29 (=89 Cal.); Hes. *Op.* 1 ff.; Arat. 1 ff.; Aristides 43 (εἰς Δία) 31. Mommsen (1878), 300 ff. (writing before the discovery of the *Paianes*), argued that Zeus should be expected to have a role in the Theoxenia, which was open to the whole pantheon of deities.

³ For the use of *κῶμος* in cult see Prop. 4. 9, with Cairns (1992); Pinotti (1977). It is probably this context of male sexuality which accounts for the similarity to the opening of *Pyth.* 6 (in honour of the young Thrasyboulus of Acragas): ἀκούσατ' ἢ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτης | ἀρουραν ἢ Χαρίτων | ἀναπολίζομεν ('Listen! We plough the field of Aphrodite with her glancing eyes or of the Graces'); there is no special link between the two songs, *contra* Wilamowitz (1922), 131, referring to (1901), 1287, and Gentili (1979), 7; see Radt (1958), 90. On the date see n. 95.

⁴ So Wüst (1967), 121. The metaphor occurs also at fr. 150: *μαντεύω, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ* ('Prophecy, Muse, and I will interpret'), on which see Dodds (1951), 82. For corresponsion between the needs of the worshipper and the divine epithets he uses when addressing the deity see Ziegler (1908), 53 ff.

⁵ On syntactic grounds it is not possible to decide whether the hearing is direct, in which case the hearer would have to be within earshot of Delphi (so Radt), or

his arrival:⁷ to defend the citizens of Delphi,⁸ and to defend his own privileges (τιμαί)—presumably privileges accruing to him in this festival.⁹ The threat to his privileges is a crisis which he has to confront, much as later in the song Neoptolemus will fight for the sake of his Delphic honours, though with different results.

After this, he repeats that he is arriving, using the language of metaphor (lines 12 ff.): he obeys his heart as he would obey his mother (since the χορός is composed of νέοι, the word παῖς need not be part of the image). This language may also have a ritual resonance, because in his short song in honour of Demeter at Hermione (SH 206) Aristocles describes how an old woman is able to lead a large bull by the ear to the altar for sacrifice, and he says of the bull ὁ δ' ὡς ματέρι παῖς ἔπεται ('It follows as a child follows its mother'). We cannot rule out the possibility that Aristocles imitates Pindar, but against this is the fact that the expression fits the context of Aristocles' song better than that of D6.¹⁰ In any case, it is meant to convey a certain attitude of naïve and meek simplicity with which the speaker approaches Delphi. The speaking subject seems to be the poet. The phrase ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν suggests prima facie a poet, and if the χορός performing the song were Delphi-

indirect, in which case the hearer need not have been near Delphi (so Wüst (1967), 121).

⁶ For a possible cult of the Muses at Castalia see Rutherford (1990), 196 ff.; Hardie (1996).

⁷ ἄ[λ]έξων is presumably future tense: thus Wüst (1967), 122, comparing the middle ἀλέξομαι at Soph. OT 171, 539; Xen. An. 7. 7. 3; contra Radt (following Kamerbeek), who saw it as a present-tense form. ἔταις . . . τεοῖσιν and ἐμαῖς . . . τιμ[α]ῖς are parallel, both dependent on ἄ[λ]έξων ἀμαχανίαν, as Radt showed; GH had supposed that ἄ[λ]έξων governs (1) ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν τεοῖσιν ('relieving') and (2) ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς ('furthering'), influenced by Σ 11; but Radt pointed out that ἀλέξω + dative in the latter sense usually has an animate object. The scholiast is probably in fact saying merely that ἔταις . . . τεοῖσιν and ἐμαῖς . . . τιμ[α]ῖς are parallel, the usual force of ἀπό κοινοῦ in the Pindaric scholia (Dr i. 47. 26; 50. 19; 91. 6; 192. 17; etc.).

⁸ Similar is Hom. Il. 6. 262 τὴν κέκμηκας ἀμύνων σοῖσιν ἔτῃσι ('you are tired, defending your citizens'). In Homer ἔτῃς generally indicates a member of a group, probably a kin-group: see Andrewes (1961), 134 ff.; Stagakis (1968); in the 5th cent. BC it means 'private citizen', as opposed to a magistrate, e.g. at Aesch. Su. 247; TrGF iii. 281a 28; Thuc. 5. 79. 4 (Doric dialect); Eur. TGF 1014. The breathing is uncertain: it is rough in Π⁴, which is what we would expect if the etymology is from *stve-la-, but other sources suggest that it may have been smooth; see Forssman (1966), 1.

⁹ I follow Radt in taking τιμαί to refer to particular privileges (as the plural generally seems to do in Pindar) and not the general concept of honour; for τιμαί in this sense see also Braswell (1988), on Pyth. 4. 260.

¹⁰ I would like to thank A. Westervelt for alerting me to this parallel.

ans (compare the title), then lines 10–11 rule out the possibility that the speaking subject could be a member of the *χορός*. This interpretation makes good sense of lines 7–11: the poet heard that Delphi needed a *χορός*, and has therefore come to help the citizens of Delphi (so he perhaps described himself as helping—*βοαθοῶν*—the Delphians at *Nemean* 7. 34),¹¹ and to protect his own honours (*τιμαί*). Radt argues that the *τιμαί* in line 11 are concrete privileges enjoyed by Pindar at Delphi, such as *προεδρία* and *προμαντεία*. Such honours are attested in certain late sources, among them a passage of Plutarch according to which Pindar and his descendants were given the right to a choice portion (*μερίς*) of the sacrifice at the Delphic Theoxenia. Support for this hypothesis is adduced from later awards to poets at Delphi.¹²

Two columns of Π⁴ are missing after the opening prayer; isolated scholia to lines 36 ff. offer no insight. The text resumes with a question addressed to the Muses (line 50) about the origin of something connected with the immortals. Editors have favoured the supplement *ἀθανάτων ἔρις*, reading back from lines 87 ff., which describe how Apollo quarrelled with Hera and Athena. However, ‘strife among the immortals’ seems to play only an incidental role in the narrative of the song, so I doubt whether the singer would be asking the Muses for information about this. I prefer the supplement *ἀθάν[ατος πόνος]*, which would refer to the duty of performing a song which could be said to be immortal in so far as it is performed every year at the festival. Compare C2. 21–2, and *ἀθανάτοις ἄμοι-|[βαίς]* of Delphic sacrifice at Aristonoos, *παιάν*, 27–8. The singer would thus be asking the Muses to explain the origins of the Delphic Theoxenia, and it seems to support this that he does in fact go on to talk about the aetiology of the festival.

The first triad ends with an elaborate invocation of the Muses.¹³ The singer appeals to them to ‘listen’ as he sings, which is both an abbreviated prayer (‘listen [to my request and grant my prayer]’),

¹¹ The reading *βοαθοῶν* with first-person *μόλον* is favoured by Lloyd-Jones (1973), 132 (=1990), i. 145–6; Wüst (1967), 154; Segal (1967), 445 ff.; Köhnken (1971), 67, has *βοαθοῶν* with *μόλεν*. One can compare the epithets *βοηδρόμος/βοαθός* as an epithet of Apollo in Call. *Hym.* 2. 69, 4. 27, and the Delphic month *Βοαθός*; see Most (1985), 158 n. 103.

¹² See pp. 179–80; Radt (1958), 115 ff.

¹³ I follow Ferrari’s (1992a) excellent *ἴσατ[ε]*. The older *ἴσθ’ ὅτ[ι]* required an awkward double syntactical embedding: ^A[ἀλλά—^B[παρθένοι γάρ, ^Cἴσθ’ ὅτι, *Μο[ῖσαι, πάντα . . .]* ^C τοῦτον ἔσχετ[ε τεθ]μόν]^B—κλύτε νῦν.]^A Pindar can place *ὅτι* in the second position in its clause (*Ol.* 8. 33; 1. 60; *Pyth.* 5. 20; 8. 58; *Isth.* 8. 5; D6. 115); but for this to be combined with *ἀλλά . . . γάρ* in this way is unparalleled.

as in the similar prayer at the start of Solon, *IEG* 13: . . . Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, κλυτέ μοι εὐχομένῳ ('Pierian Muses, listen to my prayer') (cf. C2. 15 ff.), and also suggests that the Muses listen to the singer, shifting from the role of bestowers of inspiration to a sort of divine audience.¹⁴

With the opening of the second triad, the singer moves on to the Theoxenia. A θεοξένια was a festival which centred on a meal believed to be shared by the gods, either as hosts or as guests.¹⁵ The Delphic Theoxenia was yearly,¹⁶ and probably took place in the Delphic month of Theoxenios, i.e. in March–April.¹⁷ That it was a panhellenic festival is clear from lines 62 ff. (sacrifice offered on behalf of all Greece);¹⁸ from the fourth century BC we have a religious treaty between Delphi and Skiathos mentioning the Theoxenia.¹⁹ Heroes were also imagined as partaking of the meal, to judge from a scholion on *Nem.* 7. 46;²⁰ various sources report that participants received a share in the general offerings.²¹ D6.

¹⁴ The use of formulae like κλυτέ in prayers is discussed by Schmitt (1967), 195 ff.

¹⁵ Theoxenies: Deneken (1881); F. Pfister, *RE* s.v. *Theoxenia*, xA. 1711, and s.v. *Theodaisia*, xA. 2256–8; Gill (1974); Flückinger-Guggenheim (1984), 24 ff.; Nock (1944), 1152–4 (repr. 1972: 585–6); Burnett (1970), 24–5; Bruit (1990); Krummen (1990), 121, 223 ff.; Cairns (1992), 79. On the related ritual represented by the Roman *lectisternium* and perhaps by the Mycenaean *re-ke-(e)-to-ro-te-ri-jo* (Py Fr 1217) see Palmer (1963), 250–2; Milani (1976); on similar practices in Egypt see Koenen (1967), with *POxy* 3693.

¹⁶ Σ 62; Philod. παίων, 110–11.

¹⁷ For Delphic chronology see von Pomtow (1901), 2532; Samuel (1972), 74.

¹⁸ Impersonal form of θύεται: see p. 22 n. 24.

¹⁹ *LSCGS* no. 41. 83–4; Amandry (1939), 209 ff.; (1944–5), 413 ff. In the 3rd cent. BC an Athenian Cleochares composed a song for the Theoxenia, which may indicate Athenian involvement (*SIG* 450 = *FD* iii/2 no. 78); and Hermocles of Chios filled a krater at the Theoxenia (*SIG* 579), which may indicate Chian involvement (cf. *Her.* 6. 27). There is no reason to think that the Theoxenia was any less open in the 5th cent. BC. For the Delphic Theoxenia see, in addition to the references cited in n. 15, Nilsson (1906), 160–2; F. Pfister, *RE* s.v. *Theoxenia*, xA. 2256–8; Burkert (1985), 107 ff.; Stefos (1975), 194 ff.

²⁰ Dr iii. 125. 26 γάνεται ἐν Δελφοῖς ἥρωσι ξένια, ἐν οἷς δοκεῖ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ξένια καλεῖν τοὺς ἥρωας ('At Delphi a guest-festival is held in honour of the heroes, at which Apollo seems to call the heroes to the guest-festival'). We should perhaps think of it as a ἥρωι ξένια; the word is found in a Thasian inscription from the 1st century BC/AD: Pouilloux (1953–8), ii. 95, 97, Inv. 1273. 23.

²¹ According to Polemo, *Περὶ Σαμοθράκης*, fr. 36 Preller (=Athen. 372 A), the celebrant who brought the biggest turnip (γηθυλλίς) to the Theoxenia was rewarded with a share (μοῖρα) from the sacrificial table; a religious treaty between Delphi and Skiathos refers to the assignation of μοῖραι, and these are surely shares of meat (*LSCGS* no. 41. 30–1); Plut. *De ser. num. vind.* 557 F, tells us that Pindar and his descendants had a right to a portion (μερίς) of the sacrifice at the Theoxenia, and this is probably a reliable source for the general nature of sacrifice there, even if the information that Pindar enjoyed the privilege is false: pp. 179–80.

62 ff. seems to provide an aetiology for the festival: the Delphians prayed for an end to a famine, and Zeus was invoked for some reason (line 67, with Σ).

After the account of the Theoxenia, there is a reference to an oracle and a word meaning 'from Delphi'—perhaps referring to the dissemination of oracles. In line 72 καί ποτε[probably marks the start of a myth.²² To judge from line 75, this had to do with Troy. The drift becomes clear only in line 78, which refers to Apollo in the form of Paris shooting Achilles.²³ What precedes is less clear. The παῖς in line 76 might be Achilles (παῖς [Πηλέως] or some man who brought Achilles to Troy (e.g. παῖς [Λαερτίου]). A further problem is posed by πανθοο[in line 74: Snell reads -παν θοδ[ν, the idea being that θοδ[ν refers to Achilles, who has been sent for in consequence of an oracle that declared that Troy could not be taken without him.²⁴ Pindar does not otherwise use θοός of heroes.²⁵ Earlier, Grenfell and Hunt had proposed Πάνθοο[ν, the name of the priest of Apollo at Troy and father of Poulydamas and Euphorbus, and Tosi pointed to the late tradition that Panthoos was originally a priest at Delphi but was abducted and brought to Troy by a son of Antenor.²⁶ One

²² So *Isth.* 4. 52 καί τοί ποτ' Ἀνταίου δόμους ('and once the house of Antaeus'), more commonly relative + ποτε.

²³ Cf. Hygin. 107: 'Apollo iratus Alexandrum Parin se simulans talum quem mortalem habuisse dicitur sagitta percussit et occidit' ('Apollo, angry at him, assuming the appearance of Alexander Paris, struck the mortal ankle which he is said to have had and killed him'); *ibid.* 113 'Apollo Alexandri figura' ('Apollo in the form of Alexander').

²⁴ Apollod. 3. 13. 8. 1, attributed to Calchas. Snell and Wüst (1967), 132, connect with Σ on Hom. *Il.* 19. 326 (iv. 223 Dindorf = Bernabé (1987), 56) χρησμοῦ δὲ δοθέντος μὴ ἀλώσεσθαι Ἴλιον χωρὶς Ἀχιλλέως ἐπέμφθησαν ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων πρὸς Πηλέα Ὀδυσσεὺς Φοῖνιξ καὶ Νέστωρ ('The oracle having been issued that Ilium would not be captured without Achilles, Odysseus, Phoenix, and Nestor were sent by the Greeks to Peleus').

²⁵ Maas's (1954) emendation at *Nem.* 3. 22 can be discounted; see further pp. 409–10.

²⁶ For the myth see ΣHom. *Il.* 15. 522 (iv. 116. 1 Erbse); 12. 211 (iii. 344. 7 Erbse), and, in particular, Servius on *Aen.* 2. 318 (Thilo and Hagen (1881–1902), i. 272. 8) 'verso Ilio ab Hercule et occiso Laomedonte, Priamus iudicans vitio potius loci quam ira deorum calamitatem accidisse patriae, misit Delphos filium Antenoris sciscitaturum an eversum Ilium fas esset iisdem erigi fundamentis. erat eo tempore Apollinis Delphici sacerdos Panthus Othryos [Thilo: Othryadis] filius miranda pulchritudine. hunc filius Antenor, ut dicitur, amore captus, rapuit et Ilium perduxit, cuius iniuriam Priamus volens honore pensare sacerdotem eum Apollinis fecit' ('When Troy was destroyed by Hercules and Laomedon was killed, Priam, attributing the disaster to the weakness of the place rather than the anger of the gods, sent the son of Antenor to Delphi to ask whether it was right for Troy to be rebuilt on the same foundations. At that time Panthus, son of Othrys, was priest at Delphi. Panthus was very beautiful, and Antenor fell in love with him and carried

attraction of this hypothesis is that a reference to the abduction of Panthoos here would serve as a neat transition from Delphi to Troy, a movement which the later visit of Neoptolemus could perhaps be thought to mirror. We should have to assume that the sense of lines 73 ff. was something like: 'and once Panthoos went from Delphi to Troy, to which at a later time the son of Peleus brought troubles'.

The second triad of the song is dominated by a myth telling the story of the death of Achilles at Troy and of his son Neoptolemus at Delphi. The tone is Homeric.²⁷ The focus is on conflict between the Aiakidai on the one hand and Zeus and Apollo on the other. There are three stages: (1) the death of Achilles; (2) the role of Zeus; and (3) the role of Neoptolemus.

1. After describing how Achilles came to Troy, Pindar passes straight to his death: Apollo killed him, disguised as Paris. The detail of the disguise represents a modification of the version known to have been treated in the *Aithiopsis*, in which Paris and Apollo each had a share in killing him; the effect of the change—which is not attested before Pindar—is to accentuate the conflict between Achilles and Apollo.²⁸ At this point the focus broadens out to describe the underlying *θεομαχία*: Apollo's real adversaries were Hera and Athene. With their support, Achilles would have sacked Troy earlier, but for Apollo (cf. *Il.* 16. 700).

2. Then the focus broadens again: at a deeper level the conflict was between fate, which decreed that Troy had to fall, and Zeus, who dares not revoke it (Apollo's opposition to Achilles can thus be seen as an expression of the will of Zeus; cf. *Il.* 15. 220). The theme of conflict between Zeus and fate has Homeric precedents, particularly *Il.* 16. 432 ff., where he hesitates over the death of Sarpedon. (Pindar touches on the topic of conflict between Zeus and fate elsewhere only apropos of the prophecy of Themis at

him off to Troy. Priam, wishing to confer on him an honour in recompense for this ill treatment, made Panthus priest of Apollo'). This reconstruction is endorsed by Gentili (1979), 8; (1981), 104.

²⁷ The word *πεδάσαις* in final position in the line recalls the Homeric use of (ἐ)πέδησε of death with god or fate as the subject, sometimes at line-end, creating a rhythmical pattern similar to the one here, e.g. *Il.* 22. 5 Ἑκτορα δ' αὐτοῦ μέναι δλοή μοῖρ' ἐπέδησεν ('Deadly fate fettered Hector to stay there')—where, however, death is not involved. *παστὸν ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν* also suggests Hom. *Il.* 1. 283.

²⁸ See Procl. *Περὶ Αἰθιοπίδος* 192 Severyns (·v. 106. 8–9 Allen; p. 69 Bernabé); Hom. *Il.* 22. 359.

3. The story of Neoptolemus is told in four parts: first, the arrival of Neoptolemus and the sacking of Troy; second, his failure to escape fate and return home;³¹ third, his arrival in Molossia,³² which is said to be a consequence of Apollo's oath that he would never reach home because he had killed Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeios at Troy (following the story in the *Iliou Persis* of Arctinus);³³ and fourth, the death of Neoptolemus in Delphi. The sequence of the narrative roughly follows the order of events, except that the murder of Priam is mentioned out of sequence as part of the explanation of Neoptolemus' failure to return home. The chief problem concerns the interpretation of his death and the sense of $\mu\upsilon\upsilon\rho\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu, \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (line 118). The most reasonable interpretation is that the $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota$ are portions of the offerings made by Neoptolemus or other pilgrims at the same time, and then redistributed to them in part during the sacrifice. The word $\mu\upsilon\upsilon\rho\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu$ nicely describes a large number of portions of meat, as Radt says, as well as suggesting that the sacrifice was very large.³⁴ This interpretation would make

³⁴ Cf. πομπαῖς . . . πολυθύτοις ('processions with many sacrifices') at *Nem.* 7. 46–7. The reading μυρίαῖν, surviving at Σ *Nem.* 7. 64 (Dr iii. 129. 5 ff.), is likely; μολοῖαν (Wilamowitz) would be a form of an otherwise unattested adjective; κερυαῖν ('ordained'), suggested by Housman and supported by SnMae, Gentili (1979), 10, (1981), 105–6, and Wüst (1967), 124–5, is attractive, but neither this nor the alternative Πλυθάν preserved in Σ Π* is necessary since μυρίαῖν is comprehensible.

the account of the death in D6 much the same as that in *Nem.* 7. 40 ff.:³⁵

ῥῆχετο δὲ πρὸς θεόν,
κτέαν' ἄγων Τρωΐαθεν ἀκροθινίων
ἵνα κρεῶν νῦν ὑπὲρ μάχης ἔλασεν ἀντιτυχόντ' ἀνὴρ μαχαίρα.

(He went to the god, bringing the possessions of first-fruits from Troy, where a man struck him with a sword as he struck back over a fight about shares of meat.)

Nemean 7 adds the detail that Neoptolemus went to Delphi to offer the first-fruits of the spoils from the sack of Troy (that would be a plausible motive in D6 also), and specifies that it was a man who killed Neoptolemus (the discrepancy with D6 is not so great, because Pindar has already established that Apollo can act in the form of another: cf. lines 79–80). It does not mention the implication in D6 that Neoptolemus was punished by Apollo for killing Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeios.

Neoptolemus was worshipped at Delphi,³⁶ and he may have had a special role either at the Theoxenia or in Delphic cult generally. There is a suggestion of this in *Nem.* 7. 44 ff., which tells how after Neoptolemus was killed in a fight over sacrificial meat, he came to occupy a position in Delphic ritual:

ἀλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον ἀπέδωκεν· ἐχρῆν δέ τιν' ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιάτῳ
45 Αἰακιδᾶν κρεόντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι
θεοῦ παρ' εὐτειχεᾶ δόμον, ἥροϊαίς δὲ πομπαῖς
θεμισκόπον οἰκεῖν ἔόντα πολυθύτοις.

(But he paid the allotted share of fate; it was ordained that one of the Aiakidai rulers should remain in the most ancient sanctuary in future by the well-built house of the god, and dwell as an overseer of heroic processions with their many sacrifices.)

The adjective *θεμισκόπος* applied to him at *Nem.* 7. 47 could well refer to observance of justice in sacrifice.³⁷ The scope of this observance is defined as *ἥροϊαίς . . . πομπαῖς . . . πολυθύτοις*, which could well refer to the Theoxenia if, as the scholiast suggests, this

³⁵ This is version 3 in Fontenrose (1960), 212. Besides Pindar, we have Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F 64a.

³⁶ Paus. 1. 4. 4 says that the cult of Neoptolemus began only after the invasion of the Gauls in 278 BC; the structure generally identified with the tomb of Neoptolemus mentioned at Paus. 10. 24. 6 is probably of the 4th cent. BC: see J. Pouilloux, *FD* ii/9. 53 ff. But the cult must have been older: see Fontenrose (1960), 191 ff.; Pouilloux, loc. cit.

³⁷ For *θέμις* in Delphic cult see pp. 215, 397.

involved heroes.³⁸ Such observance would have been important at the Theoxenia since sources suggest that the distribution of the sacrificial meat was an important element in this festival.³⁹ Thus the ritual role of Neoptolemus as an overseer of justice would stand in an antithetical relationship to his mythical role as archetypical disrupter of the sacrifice.⁴⁰

To return to the Paean, the detail that Neoptolemus was killed in a fight over *τιμαί* is reminiscent of the opening of the song, in which the singer says that he has come to Delphi to defend its citizens and his own *τιμαί*. Considered as whole, the song thus invites the reader to compare and contrast the singer with Neoptolemus. Such a process of comparison and contrast takes place within the framework of a close interrelationship of ritual and myth which characterizes Greek religious practice. Neoptolemus is at once a negative paradigm for a singer who wants to avoid disruption to the sacrifice, but also, as *θεμισκόπος*, the guarantor of the success of the Theoxenia. In this context it is perhaps worth recalling that a perceived relationship between the role of a singer/poet visiting Delphi and the death of a hero is also indicated by the figure of Aesop, who, according to the *Oxyrhynchus Life*, was murdered by the Delphians in similar circumstances.⁴¹

The narrative ends with a two-line coda (lines 121–2), which is an address to young men (*νέοι*). This begins with the puzzling expression <ἰή> ἰήτε, the second word repeated in line 122, which may represent the ἰή part of the *παιάν*-cry and then a pluralized form of it (below I set out the various interpretations of this that have been put forward). The other major component in the coda is *μέτρα παιηό[ν]ων*, which looks as if it might be the object of <ἰή> ἰήτε. I interpret these lines as follows: *παιηόνων* means ‘*παιάν*-cries’ rather than *παιάνες*,⁴² and the speaking subject is represented as uttering *παιάν*-cries himself (<ἰή>) and calling upon the young men to do the same (ἰήτε). The position of the coda strongly suggests a *παιάν*-refrain, the most common position for which is at the end

³⁸ Cf. the Σ on *ἡροταῖς πομπαῖς* (Dr iii. 3. 125. 26 ff.), cited in n. 20 above. Caution is urged by Nilsson (1906), 163 n. 2.

³⁹ See above, n. 21.

⁴⁰ Among scholars who have held positions similar to the one outlined here are Nagy (1979), 123 ff.; Burkert (1983), 119–20; Bruit (1984). The festival in *Nem.* 7. 46 ff. was first identified with the Theoxenia by Wilamowitz (1922), 130.

⁴¹ For cultic *μίμησις* see p. 175. Aesop: *POxy* 1800 fr. 2 ii. 32–46 = Perry (1952), i, Test. 25; Wiechers (1961), 43 ff.; Nagy (1979), 125, 284–5.

⁴² See pp. 21–2.

of a section of a song, and which perhaps arose from a *παιάν*-cry uttered at the end of a ritual or prayer. And though D6 has no regular refrain, the coda at lines 121–2 resembles a *παιάν*-refrain in so far as it concludes a triad, and we can perhaps think of it as a quasi-refrain.⁴³ One reason Pindar may have included these lines here is that he felt that a reference to *παιάν*-cries would provide a satisfying formal conclusion to the long narrative in the second triad. This interpretation seems to me to be reinforced by the choice of the expression *μέτρα παιηό[ν]ων*. One might read this as a simple periphrasis (perhaps comparing the transparent *παιηόνων ἄνθεα*, ‘flowers of *παιᾶνες*’, at Bacch. 16. 8–9),⁴⁴ but I suspect that it is also meant to imply that the *παιάν*-cries are a sort of measure which marks off the preceding section of the song.⁴⁵ The whole expression would then be an effective transition to the following section.⁴⁶

The grammar of the word *ἰήτε* is unparalleled.⁴⁷ Three interpretations have been put forward. (1) Schroeder argued that it might be from a hypothetical verb *ἰήναι* formed on the basis of *ἰή*, approximately but not exactly like *αἰάζειν* from *αἰαῖ*. Wackernagel argued against this, on the grounds that the natural verbal derivative from

⁴³ See pp. 70–1.

⁴⁴ Cf. also S6–3 to –2. So in their translation GH suggested a periphrastic sense: ‘paean in full measure’. Radt (1958), 171, objects that *μέτρον* is found only in the singular in this periphrastic sense, but that is not a decisive objection (see LSJ s.v. *μέτρον* 3b). For this argument see Rutherford (1991b).

⁴⁵ Radt (1958), 171, suggests that *μέτρα* might refer to the *παιάν* refrain as characteristic of *παιᾶνες*, taking *παιηόνων* in the more usual sense of *παιᾶνες* (not *παιάν*-cries), so that *μέτρα* are what limits them. L. Kurke suggested to me that the word *μέτρα* might refer to the *ἰή* exclamation itself as a sort of measure for the *παιάν*. The difference here would be partly grammatical: with my interpretation *μέτρα παιηόνων* has to be taken as the object (internal or external) of *ἰή ἰήτε*, with Kurke’s it would be possible to take it as in apposition to it: ‘*ἰή, ἰήτε*—the measures of the *παιάν*’.

⁴⁶ Pindar often ends narratives by referring to the limits of the narrative or the appropriate measure: see e.g. Bundy (1962), ii. 73. Compare the use of the word *μέτρον* in the context of poetry at *Isth.* 1. 61–4 *πάντα δ’ ἐξείπειν, ὅσ’ ἀγώνιος Ἑρμῆς | Ἡροδότῳ πέπορεν | ἵπποις, ἀφαιρείται βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων | ὕμνος* (‘Because it has a short measure, the song prevents saying everything that Hermes of the contest supplied to Herodotus in the chariot race’). Here the *μέτρον* is equivalent to the length of the song, which, being short, does not allow for a full narration of Herodotus’ victories. The idea is different from D6. 121–2, where the *μέτρα* are the limit which the utterance of the *παιάν*-cries is imagined as imposing on the narrative and the triad, but the general force of the two passages is similar.

⁴⁷ Note, however, that Maehler has identified a possible parallel at Z3. 18.

the root *ιά* would be *ιάζω*. However, the position was revived by Radt in his commentary.⁴⁸

(2) Wackernagel suggested that *ιῆτε* should be interpreted as a pluralized interjection, analogous to *τῆτε* from *τῆ*.⁴⁹ He did not explain how he understood *μέτρα παιηό[ν]ων*. We could perhaps take it as in apposition to the interjections, defining them as the 'measures of *παιᾶνες*'. However, it is more likely to be an accusative governed by *ιῆ* *ιῆτε*, which would be felt to have a quasi-verbal force; or, we might call it an accusative absolute not directly dependent on the interjections, perhaps understanding a verb with the sense 'we utter'.⁵⁰ So the interjection *αἰαί* governs an accusative at Ar. *Lys.* 393: "*αἰαί Ἀδωνιν*" *φησὶν* ('*Αἰαί Adonis!*' she says').⁵¹ Another parallel is the refrain in the Erythraean *παιάν* to Asclepius:

*ιῆ Παῖάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν
δαίμονα κλεινότατον, ἱὲ Παῖάν.*

(*Ie Paian, Asclepius, most famous deity, ie Paian.*)

In the first stanza, *Ἀσκληπιὸν δαίμονα κλεινότατον* can be construed as the object of the verb *ἐγείνατο*, but in the second and third it can only be an accusative dependent on the composite interjection *ιῆ παιάν*.⁵² Here the accusative accompanying the interjection specifies the deity praised, whereas in D6. 121–2 it would be a sort of internal accusative and would refer to what is being sung (whether this is the *παιάν* or the *παιάν* refrain), but I do not think that this is a major obstacle: if an interjection can govern one form of accusative, it can probably govern another also.

(3) Wilamowitz suggested that the abnormal form *ιῆτε* might have

⁴⁸ Schroeder, *PLG*³, 538; Wackernagel (1943), 184=(1955–79), 883; Radt (1958), 171.

⁴⁹ Wackernagel (1943), 184=(1955–79), 883; (1957), 71 ff.; Fraenkel (1948), 163 ff. *τῆτε* comes from *Sophron*, *CGF* fr. 156; there may be another case in *δεῦτε*–*δεῦρο*.

⁵⁰ For the accusative absolute see Kühner–Gerth (1890–1904), i. 329–31; Schwyzler (1950), ii/2. 87–8; Moorhouse (1982), 46–7. I avoid the term 'accusative of exclamation', which may not exist in classical Greek. Discussion has centred around Aesch. *Ag.* 1146, on which see Fraenkel (1950), ii. 523 (arguing that it does exist, at least in the context of dirge), and Denniston and Page (1957), 174 (arguing that there are no examples until the Hellenistic period, and then only a few).

⁵¹ Bion uses the same construction in the *Lament for Adonis*, e.g. at 28 *αἰαὶ τὰν Κυθήρειαν ἐπαιάζουσιν Ἐρωτες* ('*Αἰαὶ Cythereia!*' lament the Erotes'); there may be another example in Bacch. fr. 2 *αἰαὶ τέκος ἱμερτόν* ('*Αἰαὶ* desired child').

⁵² Note that we find this reading only in the earliest Erythraean version of the *παιάν*; see §7 n. 6. Similar syntax is found in S2 (p. 403).

been meant to suggest a form of the verb ἴημι—either the second-person plural present imperative ἴετε or the second-person plural present optative ἰείτε (the latter being easier from the point of view of quantity)—which would take μέτρα παιγόνων as its object and mean ‘utter’. He supported this from the approximate equivalence implied in the Pythoetonia aetiology between ἰή and the imperative singular of ἴημι.⁵³ Position (3) was reasserted a few years later by Klaus Strunk, who used it as evidence to support a thesis that the vowel sounds εἰ and η were perceived as identical as early as the fifth century BC, and even earlier.⁵⁴ For Strunk ἐῴρυφαρέτραν ἑκαβόλον (line 111) was additional support in so far as it suggested a parallel between Apollo the shooter of arrows and the χορός shooting παιάν-cries.⁵⁵

Deciding between these positions is not easy. Position (1) is unattractive because of the objection raised by Wackernagel, but either (2) or (3) could be right. Radt argues against (3) that such paronomasia would have been out of keeping with the spirit of Greek religion, but in fact paronomasia of this sort is very often found in literary accounts of religion.⁵⁶ It may be felt to be against position (3) that the difference between the transmitted form ἰήτε and the forms of ἴημι that it is supposed to evoke is too great for it to be understood as a form of the verb. But even if ἰήτε is primarily a pluralized interjection (perhaps an *ad hoc* formation), it might nevertheless be meant to suggest a form of the verb ἴημι, in which case (2) and (3) are not incompatible. What follows is in a sense an additional factor in favour of interpretation (3), or at least in favour of some interpretation in which (3) plays a part.

It was a weakness in earlier formulations of (3) that no reason was adduced for why Pindar should suggest the Pythoetonia aetiology

⁵³ Wilamowitz (1908), 348 n. 2. Parallels for ἴημι in the sense ‘utter’: LSJ s.v. I.2. Pythoetonia aetiology of the παιάν-cry: p. 25.

⁵⁴ Strunk has five examples for the equivalence η ~ εἰ: (1) Hes. *The.* 200 (φιλορμειδέα derived from μῆδεα); (2) and (3) Call. *Hy.* 2. 97–104, Pind., D6. 121–2; (4) ἡλίσσων for εἰλίσσων in a citation of Eur. *Pho.* 3 (=1) in a hymn preserved on a late Ptolemaic ostrakon (see Haslam (1978), 158–9); (5) Ar. *Wasps*, 771–2 εἰλη ~ ἡλιάσει ~ ἡλιον, which need be no more than paronomasia. The examples prove not that these vowels were pronounced the same way, but that they were close enough to be used as a source for paronomasia.

⁵⁵ Strunk (1960), 81: ‘das Ausstoßen der Paianrufe ist nun in Vs. 121 gewissermaßen als ein ritueller Nachvollzug des göttlichen Verschießens der Pfeile aufgefaßt.’

⁵⁶ Radt (1958), 171. The etymological adaptation of Δᾶλος (fr. 33c. 6; C2. 47) would be another counter-example.

at this point. What inclines me strongly towards this hypothesis is the context: the narrative that leads up to it focuses on the conflict between Apollo and the Aiakidai, and it culminates in Neoptolemus' unsuccessful challenge to Apollo's possession of the shrine at Delphi. The reference to *παιάν*-cries in lines 121–2 makes sense in any case as a cry of triumph, but it gains special point if it is meant to recall that the first *παιάν*-cry was sung at Delphi when Apollo was fighting the Delphic dragon—the Delphic myth *par excellence*. Thus Pindar recalls the origin of the genre. The success of such an allusion requires only that there should have already been a strong association between the *παιάν*-cry and the Pythoctionia, and we have already seen that this could be so. And I think it is a point in favour of this approach that—as I showed in my discussion of 'paeanic ambiguity'—it seems to be characteristic of references to the *παιάν* or the *παιάν*-cry in Greek literature that they are highly allusive and complex, and in particular that reference to the *παιάν* in a positive context sometimes has negative overtones—e.g. the *παιάν* sung at the end of Sappho 44 or the *παιάν* which Iphigeneia sang at her father's *συνπρόσιον* in the parodos of the *Agamemnon*. I would add that the position of this allusion—at the end of the myth and of the triad—is in line with the general tendency of allusions to come at the beginnings and ends of strophes, antistrophes, or lyric sections.⁵⁷

The point of the allusion would be to suggest that the conflict between Apollo and Neoptolemus is analogous to the Pythoctionia (and the present song analogous to the original *παιάν*). There is an interesting parallel for this analogy in the two Hellenistic *Paianes* preserved in the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, in which Apollo's presumed defeat of the Gallic invasion of 278 BC has the Pythoctionia as an explicit model.⁵⁸ Neoptolemus is punished by Apollo not only for challenging the god's authority at Delphi, but also for impieties that were committed in another time and another place: for slaying the defenceless Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, and in general for his brutality during the sack of Troy (Polygnotus portrayed this violent behaviour, though not the slaying of Priam, in his *Iliou Persis*, housed in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi above the shrine of Neoptolemus).⁵⁹ It is interesting that

⁵⁷ §11 for paeanic ambiguity; on the position of allusions see Garner (1990), 188–9.

⁵⁸ Athenaios, *παιάν*, 18–21; Limenios, *παιάν*, 26–35, 141, 149.

⁵⁹ Paus. 10. 26. 4. He has killed Elasmus and is in the act of killing Astynous. The

Neoptolemus' violent nature is symbolized in later literature by the idea that he is a snake: we find this in Virg. *Aen.* 2. 471–5 at a point when he is about to kill Priam. This could just be a reminiscence of Hector in Hom. *Il.* 22. 93–5, but it might also reflect Virgil's understanding of Pindar's idea.⁶⁰

These factors prompt a closer look at the expression μέτρα παι-
ηό[ν]ων at D6. 121–2: its primary meaning is that of a structural 'measure' with respect to the end of the second triad and the transition to the third, but the expression also gestures towards a broader moral measure symbolized by Apollo. The moral sense is commoner in the case of singular μέτρον, though we find it in the plural also, first at Hes. *Op.* 694.⁶¹ And Pindar, although he too uses the singular most commonly in the sense of 'moderation', also expresses this idea in the plural at *Isth.* 6. 71.⁶² At D6. 121–2 the expression μέτρα παιηό[ν]ων suggests that the παιάν-cries are not merely measures in the semi-literal sense that they form a conclusion to this section of the song, but that they also constitute a sort of moral measure in so far as they remind one of Apolline moral authority and in particular the Pythoctionia.⁶³

position of the painting—in the Cnidian Lesche behind the temple of Apollo at Delphi—may indicate that this detail was meant to comment on the role of Neoptolemus at Delphi. See Kebric (1983), 22–3 (sceptical); Woodbury (1979), 96–7. On vases Neoptolemus is represented simultaneously slaying Priam and holding Astyanax: see O. Touchefeu, *LIMC* s.v. *Astyanax*, ii. 931–7.

⁶⁰ Livrea (1989), 142 n. 9, has suggested that the δράκων at Lyc. 327 might stand for Neoptolemus the sacrificer of Polyxena (as well as Agamemnon the sacrificer of Iphigeneia), and that that passage and Virg. *Aen.* 2. 471–5 might go back to a common source: 'perhaps the Virgilian simile depends on the same lost material that suggested the serpent image to Lycophron.' For the influence of D6. 121–2 on Virgil see König (1970), 74; I owe this reference to N. Horsfall.

⁶¹ Wilkins (1926) lists parallels, from e.g. Theognis; add now Stes. *Iliou Persis*, *PMGF* S89. 8.

⁶² μέτρα μὲν γνώμας διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων ('pursuing moderation in thought, and holding moderation'). Almost immediately before (lines 66–8) there is an allusion to Hes. *Op.* 412 μελέτη δὲ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει ('practice helps the task'); perhaps the plural μέτρα, which is unique in this sense in Pindar, recalls *Op.* 694; in general see Slater (1969a), s.v. a; the sense 'moderation' in the singular occurs at *Ol.* 13. 48; *Pyth.* 2. 34; 8. 78; *Nem.* 11. 47.

⁶³ This type of double meaning, in which moral and poetic senses are simultaneously conveyed by the same word, finds a parallel in Pindar's use of *καίρως* in the *Epinikia*, where both moral and technical generic senses can be combined: J. A. Wilson (1980), 180 ff., referring to *Pyth.* 9. 78; *Ol.* 13. 48; *Nem.* 1. 18; *Pyth.* 1. 81; see Pohlenz (1933), 67=(1965), 114. So ἁρμονία at *Pyth.* 8. 68 has the primary meaning 'harmony', but also the overtone 'appropriateness'. For Apolline morality in *παιάνες* see pp. 172–3.

According to the scholia to *Nemean* 7, Aristarchus and his pupil Aristodemus advanced a theory that the Aeginetans were offended at the account of the death of Neoptolemus in D6, and that Pindar composed *Nemean* 7 to apologize (the 'apology hypothesis'), rather as Stesichorus was supposed to have composed his palinode to apologize for defaming Helen. Specifically, the Aeginetans thought that D6 implied that Neoptolemus was guilty of *ieroσyλία* and that Pindar cleared up the ambiguity in *Nemean* 7 by explicitly stating that Neoptolemus died in a dispute over sacrificial meat.⁶⁴

This has been widely doubted recently on various grounds: because Pindaric scholia are thought to be in general unreliable;

⁶⁴ Three scholia are relevant: (1) Σ*Nem.* 7. 48 τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει (Dr iii. 126. 8 ff.), attributed to Aristarchus: ἐπεὶ μέμψις τοῖς Αἰγινήταις πρὸς ποιητὴν ἦν χάριν τοῦ Νεοπτόλεμου, εἰς τὴν ἀπολογίαν τὴν περὶ Νεοπτόλεμον δικαίως διαρκέσει τρία ἔπεα ('Since the Aeginetans criticized the poet because of Neoptolemus, three words will justly suffice for the defence of Neoptolemus'); (2) Σ*Nem.* 7. 64 (Dr iii. 129. 4) (anonymous) καθόλου γὰρ ἀπολογεῖσθαι βούλεται περὶ τοῦ Νεοπτόλεμον θανάτου πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγινήτας. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἡτιῶντο τὸν Πίνδαρον, ὅτι γράφων Δελφοῖς τὸν Παῖα να ἐφῆ: ἀμφιπόλοισι μαρνάμενον | μυριάν περὶ τιμᾶν ἀπολώλενα ('For in general he wants to defend himself concerning the death of Neoptolemus against the Aeginetans. For they had levelled against Pindar the charge that in the *Paian* he wrote for the Delphians he said: "As he quarrelled with the attendants over vast prerogatives he perished"'); and (3) Σ*Nem.* 7. 103 (Dr iii. 137. 3 ff.), attributed to Aristodemus, the pupil of Aristarchus: ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοδῆμος, ὅτι μεμψθεὶς ὑπὸ Αἰγινήτων ἐπὶ τῷ δοκεῖν ἐν Παῖασι εἰπεῖν τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ἐπὶ ἱεροσyλῇ ἐληλυθέναι εἰς Δελφούς, νῦν ὥσπερ ὑπεραπολογεῖται, εἰπὼν ὅτι οὐχ ἱεροσyλὼν ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ κρεῶν φιλοτιμηθεὶς ἀνῆρέθη ('Aristodemus (says) that having been criticized by the Aeginetans for seeming to say in the *Paianes* that Neoptolemus came to Delphi to rob the temple, he now defends himself, saying that he did not die while robbing the temple, but was killed when his pride was injured over offerings of meat'). There may also be a reference in D14. The author of (2) might be Aristarchus (thus E. Horn (1883), 64 n. 92; also Radt (1958), 85 n. 4) or Aristodemus. There is a good chance that some of these assignments are not reliable. According to Σ 36 (Dr iii. 124. 10 ff.), Aristarchus explained the narrative about Neoptolemus by saying that Neoptolemus was the name of the real victor, while Aristodemus (according to D: B reads 'Aristarchus') said that it was the name of the victor's trainer. There is a prima-facie incompatibility between these interpretations and those attributed to Aristarchus and Aristodemus elsewhere. So perhaps there has been confusion among the names of the scholiasts (see E. Horn (1883), 65 n. 94; Radt (1958), 85 n. 4), especially since their names seem often to have been abbreviated (Radt (1958), 9 ff.; McNamee (1981), 9–10). See also Heath (1993), who has advanced a four-stage model of the development of the theory: (1) before Aristarchus there was no apology hypothesis; (2) Aristarchus introduced a general apology hypothesis based on the end of *Nem.* 7; (3) Aristodemus modified the theory, suggesting that the section about the meat in *Nem.* 7 represented a defence of criticism concerning the account of the killing of Neoptolemus in D6; (4) at a late stage someone suggested that Ἀχαιὸς τις was a Molossian, and so a defender of Neoptolemus. My own interpretation, that the apology hypothesis is right but that the point at issue was the antagonism of Apollo represented in D6, would suit stage (2).

because it is believed that an *Epinikion* is essentially a self-contained rhetorical encomium, so that its meaning ought not to depend on this sort of external circumstance; because the existence of two or more versions of a myth in different Pindaric songs is probably not something which demands a special explanation; and because any differences between such versions can always be explained by a hypothesis taking account of the different functions and occasions of the songs.⁶⁵

To develop the last point, it could be argued that the treatment of the myth of Neoptolemus in *Nemean* 7 and D6 owes something to the genre of each song. Thus, we could say that the *Paian* is concerned with the aetiology of the Theoxenia and how Apollo intervened in his career and that of his father Achilles; whereas in the *Epinikion* Neoptolemus is meant to be a paradigm of a glorious life, so that Pindar naturally omits or plays down discreditable elements.

There would be no reason to take the apology hypothesis seriously were it not for the last words of *Nemean* 7 (lines 102-4), where (most unusually) Pindar seems to refer back to the myth:

τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε φάσει κέαρ
ἀτρώποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι
ἔπεισι.

(My heart will never say that it has dragged Neoptolemus with unturning words.)

The implication is that Pindar was thought to have presented an unflattering picture of Neoptolemus somewhere else. Some scholars have argued that the lines have no such implication and that they amount simply to an encomiastic epilogue.⁶⁶ But the very fact that such an epilogue would be unique is a point in favour of taking it as a unique reference to some other real treatment of the myth. What that might have been is another matter. It could have been an account of his war-crimes during the sack of Troy. Alternatively, it could have been an unflattering version of his death: either the story that he went to the temple to demand retribution for Apollo's

⁶⁵ Unreliability of scholia: p. 150. Self-contained encomium: Bundy (1962), 1, 4, 29 n. 70; Köhnken (1971), 37 ff. Parallel versions of a myth: e.g. of the birth of Heracles in *Nem.* 1 and S1. Different function and occasions of songs: Köhnken (1971) stresses that the different nationalities of the performers of the two songs would have motivated different emphases in the treatment of the myth.

⁶⁶ Slater (1969b), 91 ff.; Köhnken (1971), 80 ff.; a variation of this is found in Arrighetti (1987).

having killed Achilles (this is first attested in Euripides) or else the story that he went to plunder the temple outright (this is attested only much later).⁶⁷ The idea of contrasting favourable and unfavourable versions of the death of Neoptolemus is shown to be current in the fifth century BC by Euripides' *Andromache* (lines 50–4), which presents two contrasting visits to Delphi, an earlier one in which Neoptolemus demanded recompense for his father's death, and a later visit in order to atone for the earlier one.

So far the apology hypothesis seems defensible, and the ancient critics could be right. However, the identification of the earlier version with the one in D6 poses a problem. On the one hand, the Hellenistic critics at least had the full range of Pindar's output to work with, so we should perhaps defer to them in this. On the other hand, the description of the death of Neoptolemus in D6 does not imply that he died sacking the temple, and need not, in fact, entail a version different from that of *Nemean* 7. If the Aeginetans drew a different conclusion, they were being over-sensitive. However, it may be that it is only on that detail that the Hellenistic critics were wrong: it could be argued that the feature of D6 which offended the Aeginetans was not its description of the manner of Neoptolemus' death, but its implication that Apollo brought this about because of a sacrilegious killing committed by Neoptolemus at Troy, and that this episode was a continuation of an antagonism between Apollo and Neoptolemus. This aspect of the story might have been more emphasized in Delphi, where the dramatic manner of the death was the focus of attention, whereas in Aegina there might have been a tendency to portray him as a worthy Aiakid who came to an unfortunate end.⁶⁸

We turn now to the third triad. It has recently emerged that this begins with an independent title, *For the Aeginetans in honour of Aiakos a prosodion*.⁶⁹ There is also a trace of what seems to be an *asteriskos*, indicating the beginning of a new song. The appearance

⁶⁷ These two versions of the story of his death are versions 1 and 2 in Fontenrose (1960).

⁶⁸ By contrast, Woodbury (1979), 115 ff., has suggested that in view of evidence for Neoptolemus' connection with Thessaly and west Greece (Molossia: Pind. *Nem.* 4. 51 ff.; Aenis: Heliod. *Aith.* 2. 34–3. 3), the negative portrayal of Neoptolemus in D6 might indicate contemporary antagonism between Delphi and these areas; see also Zunker (1988), 224–6. It is worth noting that my hypothesis of Aeginetan performance would be difficult to reconcile with this.

⁶⁹ The second title was previously taken as a scholion on line 108. For this argument see further Rutherford (1997b).

of a title and *asteriskos* at this point in the text might seem strange, but it is corroborated by a scholion next to line 124:⁷⁰ ἐν τῷ ᾧ [τ]ῶν προσοδ[ι]ῶν φέρεται ('It appears in the first book of the *Prosodia*'). This use of φέρεται is standard scholarly language: a particularly apposite parallel is from the proem to the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* (cf. Hes. fr. 195): τῆς Ἀσπίδος ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ Καταλόγῳ φέρεται μεχρὶ στιχῶν ν' καὶ ζ' ('The start of the shield appears in the fourth Catalogue, up to line 56'). In both cases a passage occurred in two parts of the ancient edition of an author's works.⁷¹

The third triad starts with an abrupt change of subject. We move from the death of Neoptolemus to the illustrious theme of Aegina, her living glory in the present and her marvellous origin in the distant past. The contrasting succession of themes is striking; in the context of Delphi one is reminded of the transition (alluded to in Bacch. 16) from the sombre διθύραμβος performed in winter to the joyful παιάν which welcomes back Apollo in the spring. The sequence here is analogous. (Neoptolemus resembles Dionysus at least in so far as both had graves at Delphi).⁷²

The section on Aegina falls into three parts. It begins with an invocation of Aegina as renowned (fame is both the premiss and the result of the present encomium) and as a ruling island (the adjective μ[ε]δέοισα is particularly at home in religious poetry).⁷³ By an image that seems to develop from this idea, the island is invoked as a bright star, offset by the background of the sea (compare the description of Delos at *Hymn to Zeus* fr. 33c 6, though in that case there is an etymological connection with the name Asteria).⁷⁴

Next comes a transitional section: because of the island's fame, the singers will praise it. The metaphors are bold: first (lines 127 ff.) they say that they will not send her to sleep without a feast of παιᾶνες: the expression suggests the singing of παιᾶνες at συμπόσια, and makes us think of the Theoxenia.⁷⁵ Next (lines 128–9) Aegina

⁷⁰ This restoration was proved by D'Alessio's demonstration that fr. 108 of Π⁴ belongs here, confirmed by the fit on the recto (AR 5. 13–14 = line 52 in Bagnall, Frier, and Rutherford (1997), 34).

⁷¹ This usage is discussed further in Rutherford (1997b), 9–12.

⁷² See pp. 88–9. Fraenkel (1957), 401, finds an echo of the abrupt transition between the two triads in Hor. *Odes*, 4. 6. 29.

⁷³ Pertinent parallels include Alc. 354V Ἀχιλλεύς ὁ τὰς Σκυθίας μέδεις ('Achilles who rules Scythia'), with Hommel (1980), 11 n. 14; Soph. *TrGF* iv. 371 (*Laocoon*).

⁷⁴ See pp. 370–1.

⁷⁵ So Farnell (1930), ii. 176 n. 1, takes ἄδορπον as implying that performance of the

is pictured as an island in the sea receiving waves of song (the association between poetry and water was well established, but the word *ρόθια* is meant specifically to suggest the repeated roar of *παιάν*-cries).⁷⁶ Being addressed in song in this way, the island will be in a position to recount the origin of its two principal virtues: its sea power (*ναυπρύτανιν δαίμονα*) and its excellence in international relations (*θεμίξεον ἀρετ[άν]*).⁷⁷ (There is a mild paradox here because one would expect Aegina to know her own history anyway.)

The third section is the narrative: both the virtues mentioned were bestowed by Zeus, who abducted Aegina, daughter of the River Asopus, from Phlius.⁷⁸ Their love-making is symbolized by golden tresses of *αἰθήρ* covering Aegina, which is reminiscent of the golden cloud in the Homeric *Dios Apate* (*Il.* 14. 350 ff.).⁷⁹ By an elegant *σύλληψις*, when Pindar says that the golden hair covered *νῶτον ὑμέτερον* ('your back': *ὑμέτερον* stands for a singular, as often in hymnic contexts),⁸⁰ the reference is both to the back of the Asopid

παιάν is a form of sacrifice. This fits the theoxenic nature of the festival celebrated in D6 (Hoekstra (1962), 5, overinterprets: 'instead of there being a sacrificial meal, you will be honoured in a paean'). For the idea of a sacrifice of poetry see also fr. 86a *θύσων διθύραμβον* ('to sacrifice a διθύραμβος'); *Vit. Ambr.* Dr i. 3. 18 *παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς Δελφοὺς καὶ ἐρωτώμενος τί παρέστι θύσων, εἶπε: παιᾶνα* ('Arriving at Delphi and being asked what he was there to sacrifice, he said: "A παιᾶν"'); Call. fr. 494 *ἄκαπνα γὰρ αἰεὶ ἄοιδοι | θύομεν* ('We poets always sacrifice offerings without smoke'). I would adduce the parallel of *ἀπαρχαῖς τῶν ἀγώνων* in *SIG 71 IL* (= *FD* iii/2 no. 48) 12 (inscription for Puthais, 3); see Rouse (1902), 64; Svenbro (1984). But what do we make of *εὐνάξομεν*? Race (1990), 61–2, takes it as a metaphor for the obscurity which results from the absence of praise; Wüst (1967), 135, connected it with marriage, so that *ἄδορπον* implies a marriage feast. It seems to corroborate this view that a few lines further on (137 ff.) Zeus and Aegina are pictured having intercourse.

⁷⁶ Similar expressions are found at G1. 16; Sim. *PMG* 519 fr. 35(b) 10; see §18 n. 9. On the metaphor see also Péron (1974), 239 ff. Hoekstra (1962), 5, suggests an over-complex interpretation, alleging that Aegina's receiving waves of song on this occasion is implicitly contrasted with the normal situation in which she sends forth waves of song—that is, in which Aeginetans send *χοροί* to Delphi.

⁷⁷ For *Θέμις* in the context of Aegina see *Ol.* 8. 22. For the hospitality of Aegina see also *Nem.* 4. 12; 5. 8; *Isth.* 9. 5 ff. For hospitality as a topos of praise see Kienzle (1936), 77.

⁷⁸ For the connection with Phlius see Diod., 4. 72. 5. This myth will have been connected with the Asopid fountain in Aegina town: Call. *Iamb.* 8; Pind. *Nem.* 3. 4; Privitera (1988).

⁷⁹ This scene seems to balance lines 92 ff. The phrase represents an interesting fusion of the golden cloud with the idea of golden hair, which seems to have traditional erotic associations in Greek literature: see Silk (1974), 159 ff., comparing Alc. 327. 2–3V; Hes. *The.* 947 ff.; Anacr. *PMG* 358. 2; Eur. *IA* 548.

⁸⁰ See p. 196 on A1. 37, and references there. Radt suggested that the poet moves from Aegina to Aeginetans, comparing Eur. *TGF* 713 (*Telephus*) ὦ πόλις Ἀργεῶς,

but also, as the adjective ἐπιχώριον shows, metaphorically to the plateau of the island.⁸¹

The lines that follow almost certainly described their son Aiakos. The adjective σωφρο]νέστατον in line 144 refers to him, and he is probably still the subject at lines 155–6, since the expression Στυγὸς ὄρκιον can be taken as a reference to the occasion when Aiakos arbitrated among the gods, mentioned also at *Isth.* 8. 23–4.⁸² After this, Pindar could have made a reference to the intercession of Aiakos with Zeus during the great drought, or he may have mentioned some other episode in the life of Aiakos—his role in the building of the walls of Troy, for example (cf. *Isth.* 8. 30 ff.). Or perhaps he moved on to the Aiakidai, how Peleus and Telamon murdered their half-brother Phocus, or the marriage of Peleus and Thetis and the birth of Achilles. A point in favour of the latter suggestion is that the third triad would then carry the story of the Aiakidai to approximately the stage where it was taken up in the second triad.⁸³

This miniature genealogy of the Aiakidai could be presented directly by the poet or it could be put into the mouth of one of the characters as a prophecy. The latter is suggested by three factors. (1) Line 170:]κλυτὰς ἴδω μ[— could represent a first-person statement by one of the characters in the song. (2) There is a tendency for segments of Aiakid genealogy to be expressed in the form of prophecy in the *Epinikia*: *Isth.* 8. 36 ff. (Themis prophesies about Peleus); *Isth.* 6. 52 ff. (Heracles prophesies to Telamon about Aiax); and

κλύεθ' οἶα λέγει ('O city of Argos, listen to what he says'). But this is no harder than a second-person plural imperative; it would be a natural way for the poet to refer to the χορός, if they are Aeginetan, but it is not even ruled out as a way for the χορός to refer to themselves. (Calder's (1977) suggestion ἀμέτερον, which implies that the χορός are Aeginetan (they refer to Aegina's back as 'our back'), does not make line 139 any easier.)

⁸¹ There is a good terminological parallel in Soph. *TrGF* iv. 776 Ἄθως σκιάζει νῶτα Λημνίας βοός ('Athos shadows the back of the Lemnian cow'); see also Archil. *IEG* 31. 2.

⁸² See p. 416. Note also the progression of thought in *Isth.* 8. 23 ff.: the role of Aiakos as an arbitrator in an unspecified dispute among the gods leads on to another dispute among the gods, that between Zeus and Poseidon for the hand of Thetis (27 ff.), to the advice of Themis (35 ff.), and to an account of Achilles (47 ff.). The words Στυγὸς ὄρκιον and δικάσαι in lines 155–6 suggested to Snell that the song might have dealt with the obscure episode in which Aiakos arbitrated between the gods referred to in *Ol.* 8 (see also Hubbard (1987a)). If I had to guess, I would say that Pindar might have gone on to deal with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and perhaps with a prophecy by someone looking forward to the career of Achilles at Troy. For these themes in Pindar see Führer (1967), 126–7.

⁸³ Perhaps κεχολωμένος in line 172 has something to do with the wrath of Achilles.

Ol. 8. 42 ff. (Apollo to Aiakos about the capture of Troy). Führer has suggested that behind these and other accounts of Aiakid genealogy we can detect a literary model in which a full account of the history of the Aiakid family was given in the form of a prophecy, perhaps at the marriage of Peleus and Thetis.⁸⁴ (3) There is a parallel song-final genealogical prophecy at *Nem.* 1. 61 ff. Who might have spoken the prophecy? Aiakos seems ruled out both because he is nowhere credited with prophetic powers and because in general genealogical prophecies are made either by gods or by seers.⁸⁵ No seer suggests himself, so it has to be a god, probably Zeus or Apollo.

Eight lines from the end of the song (176–7) the subject is still the unlimited virtues of the Aiakidai.⁸⁶ The highly obscure passage that follows has recently been illuminated by D'Alessio and Ferrari:⁸⁷ there seems to be a string of imperatives ordering someone to

⁸⁴ Führer (1967), 127. For a trace of such a prophecy see Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 350.

⁸⁵ See Führer (1967), 124–5; also on *Az.* 18 ff. A problem for the hypothesis that the last part of the third triad represents a genealogical prophecy is the absence of a concluding speech-frame in lines 171 ff., but one may have occurred in one of the lacunae.

⁸⁶ For ἀπείρονας cf. *Pyth.* 2. 64 ἀπείρονα δόξαν ('the limitless reputation'). There are other examples of the 'aretalogy' of the Aiakidai in *Nem.* 3. 32 ff.; 6. 46 ff.; *Pyth.* 8. 22 ff.

⁸⁷ D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988). The responson in line 59 allows εὐ|θαλέος in line 181, but there is then no referent for the transmitted παν in line 180. The easiest hypothesis would be that it forms one word with -ευθαλέος, but this would require the syllable to be short, and the position therefore anceps, which is metrically difficult. D'Alessio and Ferrari cut this knot by arguing that the correct restoration is παν-|θαλέος, resulting in a colometry at lines 180–1 which is different from that of the corresponding lines in the first triad. Their explanation is that there were two different texts and colometries at this point, differing by one syllable at the end of ep. 12 and in the absence of period-end at the end of lines 58=119=180:

longer e12 -υ-υ-υ-υ- || e13 -υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- ||
shorter e12 -υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ- υ-υ-υ- ||

In the first epode, Π⁴ has the longer version (the shorter one can be produced by eliminating μο[ι] in line 58):

58–9 longer κλύτε νῦν· ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] || γλώσσα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν [υ-υ-
shorter κλύτε νῦν· ἔρα[ται] δέ γλώσσα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν [υ-υ-

The second epode in Π⁴ has the shorter one (line 120 starts with τεμέ|νει), though Σ preserves the longer one: κτάνεν ἔν (>κτανεμεν):

119–20 longer δηρί|αζόμενον κτάνεν || ἐν, [τεμέ|νεί φίλῳ γᾶς παρ' ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύν.
shorter δηρί|αζόμενον κτάνεν [τεμέ|νεί φίλῳ γᾶς παρ' ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύν.

In the third triad Π⁴ has the shorter version, but again Σ preserved the longer (στεφάνοισί νιν):

180–1 longer τόνδε καὶ στεφάνοισί νιν || πανθαλέος ὕγι[ε]ας σκιάζετε· Μοισᾶν
shorter τόνδε καὶ στεφάνοισι πανθαλέος ὕγι[ε]ας σκιάζετε· Μοισᾶν

love a city, described as ancestral (πατρίαν), and 'this mild people', and to shade them in crowns of health (lines 180–1; cf. D1. 10). The imperatives are probably addressed to gods (who else could safeguard health?), perhaps to all deities present at the Theoxenia.

This prayer, in which the gods are asked to give, is balanced by a final request in which Apollo is asked to receive.⁸⁸ Μοισᾶν ἐπαβολέοντ[probably means 'having a share of the Muses'.⁸⁹ This would most naturally mean 'possessing poetic skill/inspiration', but might also imply the possession of fame, and in either case it probably refers to the singer. One might compare the anonymous *PMG* 1001 φامي̄ ἰσπολοκάμων Μοισᾶν εὖ λαχεῖν ('I say that [he has] a good share in the Muses with their violet locks'). Interpretations of the structure of the sentence vary. Snell and Maehler take ἐπαβολέοντ[ι as the indirect object of δέ[ξ](αι), and they find a direct object in the last word of the song, which they interpret as an accusative singular (θ[αλί]αν or θ[υσί]αν or perhaps ἐ[νοπ]άν), substituting an accusative singular for the genitive plural preserved in Π⁴. ἐννόμων could be fitted in by taking it to refer either to the singers ('of lawful men') or to the Muses, who are then ἀπὸ κοινοῦ: 'from one who partakes of the lawful [or tuneless?] Muses receive, Paian, this festivity/sacrifice/song of the lawful Muses'. Recently, however, D'Alessio and Ferrari have proposed an accusative ἐπαβολέοντ[α, to be taken as the direct object of δέ[ξ](αι) and governing ἐννόμων ἐ[νοπ]άν, which in turn is qualified by Μοισᾶν ('colui che ha in sorte i canti rituali delle Muse'). This would turn the sentence into a prayer to receive the singer, analogous to the end of D5.⁹⁰ A major attraction of this interpretation is the circumflex accent over the last syllable of the song in Π⁴, which shows that some scholar in possession of the full

⁸⁸ See p. 75. Radt (1958), 193–4, claims that such a request to receive is exceptional in final position, but I would compare D5. 45 ff.; Philod. παῖαν, 144; Isyllus, F 81; Anacr. *PMG* 357.

⁸⁹ The verb ἐπαβολέω occurs at Archil. *POxy.* 2317 = adesp. iamb. *IEG* 38. 11; Sappho 21. 2V; the adjective is much better attested, e.g. ἐπήβολος φρενῶν (Aesch. *PV* 444; Soph. *Ant.* 492), ἐπιστήμης, παιδείας ἐπήβολος (Plato, *Euthyd.* 289 B; *Laws* 724 B); the adjective occurs in the context of poetry at Plato, *Laws*, 666 D: ἐπήβολοι... τῆς καλλίστης ᾠδῆς ('in possession of the most beautiful song'), and at Synes. *Dion.* 4 ἑτερος ἑτέρας (sc. Μούσας) ἐπήβολος γέγονεν ('One came into possession of one Muse and one of another'), either of which could be an imitation of this *Paian*.

⁹⁰ D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988). Another detail of their reconstruction worth noticing is that the final sentence begins with asyndeton, not unusual in a prayer (e.g. A1. 38). Snell had positioned δ' at the start of line 182 (ruling out the possibility of period-end after lines 59 = 120 = 181), but this can now be rejected, along with Hoekstra's σφ'.

text took the final word to be genitive plural—and he was in a better position to interpret the text than we are (at least he knew the full transmitted form of ἐπαβολέοντ[]).

Earlier on I presented evidence that the third triad enjoyed an independent status as a *Prosodion*. How does that claim look now? One prima-facie problem is metre: surely the metrical integrity of D6 points against the third triad having been classed as an independent composition. On the other hand, we have the example of *Isthmians* 3–4, which seem to have appeared in the ancient edition as two isometric compositions.⁹¹

A second difficulty is that the third triad does not start like the beginning of a song. But this is not a decisive objection either, since the text of the relevant line need not have been identical in the two versions.

Another problem is genre. The third triad mentions *παιᾶνες* (line 127), apparently with self-reference. And the song also ends with an address to Apollo as ‘Paian’, of the sort that we would expect in a *παιάν* (line 182). Why would a song so marked as a *παιάν* not be classed as one? Furthermore, while we naturally think of the defining feature of the *προσόδιον* as performance in the course of a procession, there are no obvious signs of procession in the text.

With respect to the first point, a self-reference to the song as a *παιάν* or an address to a deity as Paian need not have been regarded as a decisive generic marker in the absence of corroborating features. Another important criterion was perhaps some sort of relevance to Apollo, but in this case the main part of the text may well have been a non-Apolline narrative (cf. *POxy* 2368).⁹² But why did it get classified as a *Prosodion*? Perhaps in the lacuna at lines 157–68 the singers were made to describe themselves as processing. Alternatively, perhaps the generic designations were transmitted along with the text of the song (was the pattern ‘*παιάν* followed by *προσόδιον*’ a traditional one at Delphi? Limenius’ *παιὰν καὶ προσόδιον* could be another reflex of the same tradition). Yet another possibility is that ancient scholars knew that the third triad was performed as a *προσόδιον* in contemporary Aegina, or somewhere else.

So the hypothesis that the third triad enjoyed an independent status as a *Prosodion* survives. What is less clear is its status in Π⁴. There are several possibilities. The most obvious one is that

⁹¹ Ancient testimony is summed up in Köhnken (1971), 87.

⁹² See pp. 97–9.

the scribe believed that the third triad was an independent song and that the preceding one ended with the second triad. Such a segmentation is comprehensible not only because the beginning of the third triad is so abrupt, but also because the end of the second triad, with its description of the death of Neoptolemus and its injunction to young men to sing *παῖνες* over him, provides a plausible ending to a song. True, there would be no formal coda, but there are plenty of parallels for songs that end more or less in the middle of the myth.⁹³

There is one objection to this view: why would 'ὄνομακλύτα . . .' have been included in the *Paianes* at all if it was thought to be a *Prosodion*? Its presence in *POxy* 841 implies that the classifier thought that it was either a *Paian* or part of a *Paian*. One way to avoid this difficulty would be to posit that there were two stages: the classification into genres comes first, then at a later point another scholar decides that the third triad is really an independent one, and adds title and *asteriskos* accordingly.

Another possibility is that the scribe who added the second title did not intend to signal that what followed was an independent song, but merely that this was the title it had in the *Prosodia*; he may not have thought that this title applied to the *Paianes* at all. A variant of this third possibility is that the title was added not (or not merely) to signal that the third triad had this title in the *Prosodia*, but with the function of a subtitle, implying that the song was regarded as a single composition with two sections: a *παῖαν* and a *προσόδιον*. Two parallels suggest themselves for this combination. One is Limenius' 'παῖαν καὶ προσόδιον', the double title of which seems to refer to a *παῖαν* (in cretic metre) and to a *προσόδιον* (in aeolo-choriambic metre). The second is the hybrid *προσοδιακὸς παῖαν* referred to in a scholion on *Isthmian* 1 and often linked to *Paian* 4.⁹⁴ A prima-facie problem with the idea of a subtitle is the trace of the *asteriskos*, which we would normally associate with the end of a song.

It is difficult to know how to decide between these three options (two songs, one song with alternative function for the third triad, one song with two divisions). The language of the scholion is non-committal. It might be argued that we would expect a *καί* if the scholiast thought that the transmission in both books was equally

⁹³ *παῖαν*-cries in final position: pp. 48, 71–2; ending with myth: Rutherford (1997a), 53–5.

⁹⁴ Limenius: pp. 34–5, 106; *προσοδιακὸς παῖαν*: pp. 106, 284.

valid (φέρεται καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾠ . . .); in that case it could be inferred that the scholiast believed that the true position was in the *Prosodia*. But in fact καὶ is not necessary, as we can see from the passage from the hypothesis to the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield* cited earlier.

Let us now consider the song as a whole. The end of triad 1 implies performance at the Delphic Theoxenia; the date of performance is unfortunately uncertain, even if we accept a link with *Nemean* 7.⁹⁵ Up until now, the central issue has been the incongruity between the title at the start, which implies Delphian dedicatees or performers, and the prominence of Aeginetan themes in the song. Three explanations have been put forward. Farnell tried to link this with the 'apology hypothesis', suggesting that the original paean (of two triads?) had offended the Aeginetans, and that Pindar added the third triad to mollify them.⁹⁶ This explanation has not won much support.

A second explanation is that there was some sort of traditional connection between Aegina and the Delphic Theoxenia, and that this was manifested on the level of myth in a link between the aetiology of the Delphic Theoxenia and the Aeginetan myth of Aiakos and the drought:⁹⁷ according to the latter, a great drought fell upon Greece in consequence of a murder (sources vary as to which one), and on the advice of Delphi the leaders of the Greeks went to Aiakos in Aegina and persuaded him to intercede with his father Zeus.⁹⁸ Scholars speculated that ἐκδι[in line 66 might have been from a form of ἐκδικία and have something to do with the

⁹⁵ The apology hypothesis does not help us with the date of the song, since the date of *Nem.* 7 is uncertain. The MSS of Σ (Dr iii. 116. 6) give ὀδ' (implied in B) and κδ' (D), i.e. the 14th Nemead (547 BC) or the 24th (527 BC), which are impossible. Several emendations of the numbers have been proposed (Dr iii. 116 apparatus): Hermann, ap. Boeckh (1818–19), iii. 416, suggested νδ', the 54th Nemead (467 BC), Gaspar (1900), 40, suggested μα', the 41st (493 BC), and Wilamowitz (1908), 345, (1922) 160 n. 2, μδ', the 44th (487 BC); another possibility would be να', the 51st (473 BC). Radt (1958), 90–3, argues tentatively for a date c.470 BC for both. To his points I would add that there are some interesting similarities to *Isth.* 8, which dates from 474 BC. Fogelmark (1972), 15 ff., also argues that both songs are post-476 BC, but his grounds (the use of colour terminology) are doubtful.

⁹⁶ Farnell (1930–2), i. 313, ii. 408.

⁹⁷ This theory goes back to Sitzler (1911d) and Tosi (1908); see also Radt (1958), 89 ff., 133 ff.; Zunker (1988), 69.

⁹⁸ See Isocr. 9. 14 ff.; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3. 12. 6. 9–10; Diod. 4. 61. 1; Paus. 1. 44. 9, 2. 29. 7 ff.; further Radt (1958) 133 n. 1. In Apollodorus Pelops murdered Stymphalos, in Diodorus the Athenians murdered Androgeos son of Minos.

murder that was supposed to have led to the drought. Again, the oracle that is mentioned in line 71 might have been the Delphic oracle which advised the Greeks to seek the help of Aiakos. In this context stress was placed on the word Πανελ-|λάδος (line 61: 'all of Greece'). Pindar might have chosen this word to suggest a connection with the title 'Hellanios' by which Zeus was known on Aegina, a title that is actually used later on in the song (lines 125-6).⁹⁹

The common aetiology theory met with a strong objection in the fact that whereas in the Aeginetan myth it was the leaders of the Greeks who asked that the drought should end, Delphian involvement being confined to the oracle, in D6. 63 ff. it seems to be the Delphians who pray that there should be an end to the famine. It looks as if the aetiology of the Theoxenia must have been an independent famine myth—no real surprise since such myths were not rare.¹⁰⁰

Some were attracted to a weaker version of this theory, according to which the myth of Aiakos and the drought was mentioned in the final stages of the song not because it was thematically connected with the aetiology of the Theoxenia but in virtue of a similarity between them.¹⁰¹ The poet might perhaps have explicitly identified the similarity and amplified it in the course of the song. This hypothesis was not out of the question, but it was unsatisfying: one would have preferred an explanation which incorporated some traditional religious or political association between Delphi and Aegina.

There were other, more attractive solutions. We have seen that Neoptolemus probably had a tutelary position at the Theoxenia, presiding over the division of sacrificial meat, so that the myth of the second triad can be seen as an aetiological myth of the festival. Now, Neoptolemus was an Aiakid, with a strong genealogical association

⁹⁹ See Radt (1958), 174 ff.; Cook (1914-40), ii. 894, iii/2. 1164 ff., referring to a bronze hydria found on Mount Panhellenios with an inscription indicating that it was dedicated to Zeus Hellanios; Paus. 2. 30. 4; Schwabl (1972), 303. Σ 125 refers to the Aeginetan drought, implying that a plurality of individuals supplicated Zeus. Radt is puzzled by the discrepancy with the usual version of the story, in which only Aiakos supplicated Zeus; I would suggest that the scholiast has confused the prayer of Aiakos with prayers of the Greeks to Aiakos described at *Nem.* 8. 8 ff., and the prayer of the sons of Aiakos to Zeus Hellanios described at *Nem.* 5. 10 ff.

¹⁰⁰ For example, the aetiology of the Delphic Charilla involved a famine (Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 293 D); for myths involving famine and plague see R. Parker (1983), 257 ff.

¹⁰¹ See Radt (1958), 89-90, 133.

with Aegina. Hence it was possible to argue that the Aeginetan emphasis of the song was a consequence of the prestigious position enjoyed by Neoptolemus at the festival. But the drawback here is precisely that the emphasis on Aegina seems to exceed what would be required to explain Neoptolemus' background: we are back where we started.

There was another solution, which involves consideration of the performance of the song. Wilamowitz originally suggested that it might have been performed by Aeginetans, and this hypothesis found a limited acceptance. John Finley reports that it was independently suggested at a later point by Arthur Darby Nock, though Nock never seems to have committed it to print. Later, Hoekstra advanced a complex variation: *παῖνες* at the Delphic Theoxenia were usually sung by *χοροί* from Aegina (in virtue of some long-standing arrangement, connected perhaps with the common aetiology theory), but on the occasion of this song the usual Aeginetan *χορός* had for some reason or another been prevented from coming, and a Delphian *χορός* had stepped in and were acting as understudies.¹⁰²

This went against the orthodox view, which is that D6 was dedicated to and performed by Delphians. Such an assumption is based on the marginal title and seems to be corroborated by an anonymous scholion to *Nem.* 7. 64 (Dr iii. 129. 5 ff.), which says that Pindar composed the *Paian Δελφοῖς*. The element in the dative plural is most naturally taken as specifying the group for whom the song was composed, and these are conceived of as members of a city-state visiting the religious centre and performing the song. So too in the case of the closest parallel to the title of D6, namely *Ἀνδρῖοις εἰς Πυθῶ* in Simonides, *PMG* fr. 35(b) 11, *Ἀνδρῖοις* could well be the performers.¹⁰³

Wilamowitz tried to reconcile this evidence with the hypothesis of Aeginetan performance by the suggestion that the word *Δελφοῖς* in the title and in the scholion denotes not the performers but the dedicatees or commissioners, who in the case of this *Paian* at least are different from the performers.¹⁰⁴ The idea that the song

¹⁰² Wilamowitz (1922), 134–5 with n. 3, referring to (1908) 345—though he seems to follow the Delphian theory there; Nock's view is quoted by Finley (1951), 72, referred to by Radt (1958), 89; Hoekstra (1962), 1 ff.; the hypothesis of an Aeginetan *χορός* is mentioned favourably also by Körte (1913), 551; Müller (1914), 20 ff.; K. Ziegler, *RE* s.v. *Neoptolemos* xxxii. 2455; Fenno (1995), 306–13.

¹⁰³ Orthodox view: Radt (1958), 89–90; titles in §14e.

¹⁰⁴ See references in n. 102.

was 'for the Delphians' would perhaps have been inspired by lines 10–11, in which the speaking subject seems to say that he is performing the song in order to help the Delphians. The absence of a self-identification by the Aeginetan χορός might be regarded as an objection to this hypothesis. However, there may have been such a self-identification in a part of the song which is lost, e.g. towards the end (the recent supplement in lines 179–80 supports that).¹⁰⁵

Such an Aeginetan χορός would have accompanied a θεωρία that was representing Aegina at a celebration of the Delphic Theoxenia. This θεωρία may have been connected with the σεμνὸν . . . Πυθίου Θεάριον ('revered Thearion of the Pythian one') mentioned by Pindar in *Nem.* 3. 69–70,¹⁰⁶ one of the functions of which could have been to serve as a place of assembly in Aegina for the θεωροί who participated in θεωρίαι to the temple of Pythian Apollo at Delphi. They may have sacrificed there before setting out, and further sacrifices may have been carried out by officials remaining behind during their absence.¹⁰⁷ Another function of the Aeginetan Θεάριον may have been to entertain θεωροί sent from Delphi to announce the great Delphic festivals. The name of Thearion, a member of the clan of the Euxenidai, whose son Sogenes is the young victor for whom Pindar composed *Nemean* 7, might indicate that this family had a special connection with the institution of θεωρία.¹⁰⁸

Pindar's description of the singers of the song as νέοι ('young men': line 122) may provide a clue about the composition of the members of the θεωρία. The term νέοι could be used in a narrower sense for young men older than ἑφηβοί (i.e. 19–20 or older), or in a broader sense to include ἑφηβοί. In either case, it is possible that the θεωρία was composed largely of young men, perhaps members

¹⁰⁵ Nock (see n. 102) was the first to suggest that a self-identification may have come at the end of the song.

¹⁰⁶ It has been argued that a Θεάριον was a temple of Apollo Θεάριος. Apollo was worshipped under this epithet in Trozen (Paus. 2. 3. 6; *IG* iv. 748. 15 (cf. 755. 10); Plut. *De E ap. Delphos*, 394 A; see Gruppe (1897–1906), i. 139. 5, 192 ff.; G. Kruse, *RE* s.v. *Thearios* xA. 1382–3). However, the wording Πυθίου Θεάριον militates against this hypothesis. For the Θεάριον see also Figueira (1981), 314–21.

¹⁰⁷ See p. 64.

¹⁰⁸ Pfister (1930), 348, suggested that a name 'Thearis' attested at Trozen might reflect the cult of Apollo Thearios there. The existence of a special connection between the family of the Euxenidai and the θεωρία to Delphi would help to explain the choice of the death of Neoptolemus at Delphi as the myth in *Nem.* 7.

of a young men's organization associated with the cult of Apollo Puthios on Aegina.¹⁰⁹

The *θεωρία* could have been a yearly event, a regular but not yearly one, or a unique occurrence. Some sort of *θεωρία* may have gone every year to honour Neoptolemus, but it seems to me unlikely that a large-scale *θεωρία* complete with *χορός* went every year. The absence of any reference to a *χορός* in an inscription of the fifth century BC regulating the Andrian *θεωρία* to Delphi (which is our best source for the institution of Delphic *θεωρία* at this period) suggests that *θεωρίαι* did not invariably have a choral accompaniment. Furthermore, most large-scale *θεωρίαι* that we hear of are either one-off events, such as the grand *θεωρία* that Dionysius the Elder, tyrant of Syracuse, sent to Olympia in 388 BC, or the *θεωρία* that Nicias led to Delos at the time of the plague, or else they take place at an interval of at least four years, such as the Puthais from Athens to Delphi, which took place every eight years provided there was lightning over Harma.¹¹⁰ I would guess that the Aeginetans sent a *χορός* to Delphi on a regular basis—cycles of four or eight years were common.

Given the hypothesis, it might be possible to re-evaluate our view of the speaking subject of the song (cf. pp. 308–9). After all, in at least two of the other Pindaric *Paianes* the speaking subject is a local singer. The phrase *αοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν* does not have to exclude anyone but the poet: the basic sense of the word *προφήτης* is 'interpreter (of the utterances of the Pythia)', and it could well be reapplied to the relation between the *χορός* (the interpreter) and the poet (the Pythia). The hypothesis that the singer is a member of a visiting *χορός* from Aegina could also make sense of the crucial lines 7–11: it could be argued that whether the sense of *τιμαί* is general or specific, they could belong to the Aeginetan singer(s). We would expect there to have been some sort of agreement between Delphi and Aegina, setting out, *inter alia*, what privileges the Aeginetan *θεωροί* were entitled to. A religious treaty between Delphi and Skiathos from the fourth century BC tells us that at that time the Delphians afforded the Skiathians the privileges of *προμαντεία*, *ἀτέλεια*, and at

¹⁰⁹ The *νέοι*: Forbes (1933); F. Poland, *RE* s.v. *Neoi*, xxxii. 2401–9; Willetts (1954); on young men's organizations and the performance of *παίανες* in general see pp. 58–9.

¹¹⁰ The Andrian *θεωρία*: p. 33. Dionysius the Elder: Diod. 14. 109, 15. 7. Nicias: Plut. *Nicias*, 3. 4. Puthais: p. 33.

the Theoxenia a share in the sacrificial meat, *προδικία*, and *ἀσυλία*.¹¹¹ The privileges enjoyed by the Aeginetans are likely to have been at least as many and as great as those afforded to the comparatively insignificant Skiathos.

All attempts to reconcile the title at the start of the song with its Aeginetan emphasis are radically reconfigured by the discovery of the second title, indicating that the third triad was believed to have been dedicated to the Aeginetans. Taken at face value, this new datum cuts the knot, because it allows us to think in terms of a Delphian song (triads 1–2) and an Aeginetan song (triad 3). But how reliable is the second title and the alternative classification of the third triad? Can we be sure that they have anything to do with the original form of the song?

There seem to be three main ways in which it could have come about. The first possibility is detachment: the song was originally a coherent three-triadic composition, but at some point the third triad was detached and came to circulate independently. Who might have detached it and when? The Hellenistic editors cannot be ruled out, but it is hard to see what their motive would have been. Pindar himself might have detached the third triad for independent use, perhaps at a time when there was a demand for hymns to Aiakos and the Aiakidai during the Persian Wars. Alternatively, the detachment could have been carried out after Pindar's death; the third triad could have been performed independently on Aegina or perhaps in some other locality (such as the Aiakeion in Athens?). We know that the cult of Aiakos enjoyed a revival on Aegina from the late third century BC, during the period of domination by Pergamum.¹¹²

If we explain the independent transmission of the third triad in some such way as this, there is no change to the issue of the original performance scenario of the song. However, the clean segmentation between the second and third triads (on the level of both theme and form) invites us to explore the possibility that the independent or semi-independent status of the third triad could be original, and here we move into an area where the traditional approach would be jeopardized.

The second possibility (B) is that the third triad was a supple-

¹¹¹ See Amandry (1939), 209 ff.; (1944–5), 413 ff.; *προμαντεία* and *ἀτέλεια* are mentioned in lines 5–6, division of shares of sacrifice in lines 30–1, *προδικία* and *ἀσυλία* in lines 32–3.

¹¹² Hellenistic cults of Aiakos: Stroud (1994); on Aegina: Allen (1971).

ment: an earlier version, without the third triad or with a different third triad, was performed at the Delphic Theoxenia, and then a revamped version, with the extant third triad, was produced for Aeginetan consumption. The prima-facie drawback with this scenario is that it fails to explain why the third triad was transmitted independently and as a *Prosodion*. But we can avoid this problem by refining our original hypothesis: perhaps the triad was composed as a semi-independent supplement to the first two triads, and always enjoyed an ambiguous status, both as an independent song in honour of Aiakos and as part of the original song.

Here a link to some version of the apology hypothesis suggests itself. Perhaps an earlier version of the song had offended the Aeginetans, and Pindar composed an independent song in honour of Aiakos as a peace offering (cf. Farnell's hypothesis). This composition will then have been incorporated in published texts of the *Paian* as a supplementary third triad.

Another approach—the third and final hypothesis I want to present here—is that the original performance of the song was split between two groups, Delphian hosts and Aeginetan visitors. The Delphians could have performed at the altar, the Aeginetans while they processed towards the altar. In that case, perhaps the coda at the end of the second triad (lines 121–2) also served to introduce the second part of the performance. On the level of ritual drama, the first two triads present a sort of crisis, culminating in the death of Neoptolemus, which is somehow put right by the arrival of the Aeginetans. After the performance, the Aeginetan *θεωροί* perhaps returned to Aegina and took only 'their part' of the song. In that case, each of the two titles in the papyrus would be accurate.¹¹³

In this way, D6 would provide an excellent example of negotiation between panhellenic and local traditions within the context of ancient pilgrimage. The arrival of a delegation at a sanctuary, and its reception (*θεωροδοκία*), was not a simple process, but a negotiation between the delegates representing their community and the community responsible for the sanctuary. This relationship is

¹¹³ The link between the two titles and the performance scenario could be either direct or indirect. It may be indirect in so far as the second title was not transmitted in the text of the song, but was inserted at a second stage from the Aeginetan *Prosodion*. But it could be direct if the two of them were both part of the original text of the *Paian*. The first scenario is supported by the fact that the hand of the second title seems slightly different from that of the first (and we would have to infer that if either of them was earlier, the first was).

well illustrated by the already mentioned inscription recording an agreement between the Sciathians and the Delphians.¹¹⁴ The community in charge of the sanctuary acted as host and facilitator, but demanded in return observance of regulations and payment. Harmonious co-operation in the process of *θεωροδοκία* is well evoked by performance of a song which is partly dedicated to the host community (and perhaps performed by a chorus drawn from them), and partly to the community represented by the delegates (and perhaps performed by a chorus accompanying them).

To conclude: it may seem that while the new data of the title and scholion at the start of the third triad might have been expected to provide a definitive solution for the problem of D6, in fact their effect has been to multiply the number of possible interpretations. But we have at least shown how what has traditionally been seen as the central problem surrounding the poem—the incongruity between the Delphic performance scenario and the Aeginetan emphasis of the third triad—can be explained by one of two extraordinary scenarios: either the original performance was split between two groups of performers, or the third triad was composed as an independent unit and only subsequently appended to the first two. The advantage of economy (it explains not only the double transmission of the third triad but also the apology hypothesis) may in the end give the ‘compensatory supplement’ scenario the edge.

D7 (*Pa.* VII)

| | | | |
|----------|------------|---|---|
| str. A | [#] | Μαντευμάτ[ω]ν τε θεσπεσίων δοτήρα | |
| Θηβαίοις | ε[15 < 15] | καὶ τελεσσιε[πῇ] | |
| προσ... | [< 15] | θεοῦ ἄδυτον [~3]ον ἀγλαάν τ' ἐς αὐλὰν | 3 |
| col. 35 | | Ὁκεανοῖο[~14]ν Μελίας | |
| 5 | | Ἀπόλλωνί γ' [~16]'. | |
| χ | | ὀριδρόμον τ[| 6 |
| | | σὺν ἀπιομ[ήδ]ει φιλα[| |
| | | γανάειν το[~2]νδε . . [| |
| | | χέων ῥαθά[μιν]γα πα[ιάνιδα | 9 |

¹¹⁴ Sourvinou-Inwood (1990), 297: ‘The *polis* anchored, legitimated and mediated all religious activity’ (speaking of the role of Delphi in dealing with pilgrims and sacred delegations).

10 Χαρίτεσσί μοι ἄγχι θ[
 γλυκὺν κατ' αὐλὸν αἶθερ[
 ἴοντι τηλαυγέ' ἄγ κορυφὰν[12
 ἦρωα Τήνερρον λεγόμεν[ον
 ~8]α ταύρων εἰ[
 15 ~10]ν προ βωμ[
 ~10]οιτ.τ.μο[~4]παρᾱ[15
 ~9 κελ]ᾶδῃσαν αὐδάν·
 ~6]αντεσι χρηστήριον
]αἰδ' ε. [
 20]δα[]εκκρα[
]ανέ[]τ' οὐρα[
]. [

1-13 (left) = Π⁴ V-VI^v (=page 32?), 1-4 (right) = Π³ IV^v; 7-18 (centre) = Π⁴ fr. 15ii;
 18-22 = Π²⁶ fr. 10(a) and (b), positioned by Sn, somewhat speculatively

TITLE Written in column in Π⁴ Ε[ΙΣ ΠΤΩΙΑ Wil, ΠΤΩΙΩΝ Sn; Ε[ΙΣ ΠΥΘΩ Diehl (1917) ΠΡΟΣ ΤΑ' Sn; ΠΡΟΣΘΑ[ΑΚΟΣ D'Alessio (1988b) 2 Wil: -ε[πέες] Galiano (1950-1); -ε[πέος]?; -ίε[ρον] παιᾶνα Vitelli (1913), but this is too long for the space in Π⁴ 3 θεοί' Sn [Πτωί]ον, [Ίσμήν]ιον Sn (1938); ἡλθ]ον D'Alessio (1988b); θησαυρ]όν? 4 [κόρας ἡνκόμο]υ Sn 5-6 [ἐρχομαι ὕμνον φέρων] | ὀρειδρόμον τ[ε κώμον e.g. Sn 6 ΟΡΙΔΡΟΜΟΝ Π³: ὀρειδρόμον Schr (1914) T[or Π] 7 Sn 8 Turyn: γα να(ί)ειν Sn; ἄ-|γανὰ εἶντο?]N or]AI ΔΕ: the accent rules out Δελφ- 9 Vitelli πα[ιάνδα e.g. Rutherford: πα[ιάνος or Πα[ιάνι καὶ Sn 10 Sn: ἀγχιθ[εος GH; ἀγχιθ]ρον— Diehl (1917) 12 ΑΓ Π³: ΕΑΝ Π⁴ 13 λεγόμεν[ον e.g. Was 15 ἱερῶ]ν πρὸ βωμ[ών? 17 GH]ᾶ 18 εὐ]αντέσι GH; κτίσε μ]άντεσι Erbse ap. SnMae; προσ]άντεσι?

Σ 1 (Π⁴) (Σ^{δ2}) ΕΠΕC

3 (Π⁴) (Σ^{ε2}) ἀρσεν-|ικ]ῶς τὸν ἄδυστον

4 (Π⁴) (left side) Something erased, perhaps ω, the column having been started too far to the left

1 ἔπεισ[ι] GH: ἔπεισι Sn 3 suppl. Diehl (1917); cf. ΣPind. *Pyth.* 11. 5 (Dr ii. 254. 21) with n. 3

MARGINAL TITLE. *For the Thebans to . . .* To the giver of divine oracles and the word-fulfilling shrine of the god . . . and the bright court of Melia, the (rich-haired daughter) of Oceanus . . . for Apollo . . . running over the mountains . . . with gentle-spirited . . . to gleam (?) . . . pouring a drop of pa(eans?) . . . with the Kharites for me next to . . . on a sweet *aulos* . . . (me) going along the far-shining peak the hero called Tenerus . . . of bulls . . . in front of the altar . . . their voices sounded . . . (he made) an oracle.

(1) (Fulfilling) the word [neut.] (3) Masculine—τὸν ἄδυτον.

What survives of D7 is reconstructed from two columns of Π⁴ and two fragments of Π⁵. The surviving fragment is probably less than a strophe, though as far as the metre is concerned, line 12 could be the first line of the antistrophe, if the παράγραφος is missing in Π⁴. Six small fragments, five of them from Π⁵, one from Π⁷, classed with the song by Snell and Maehler, need not in fact have anything to do with it.¹ There is no sign of a refrain (we would not expect one if the song is triadic).

The song opened with a three-part description of the addressees (hero, god, and mother of hero), constituting a rising tricolon, all apparently governed by the preposition ἐς in the third element. One can compare the tricolon at the start of A1. The three parts are as follows:

(1) Line 1: μαντευμάτ[ω]ν τε θεσπεσίων δοτῆρα. I take it that the reference is to a person rather than to a place, and I suggest that Tenerus is the most appropriate referent.²

(2) Lines 2–3 καὶ τελεσσιε[] | θεοῦ ἄδυτον [] ον. This refers to the shrine, presumably that of Apollo. Wilamowitz plausibly suggested τελεσσιε[πῆ] ('fulfilling the words'), inferring that the scholion εἶπες in Π⁴ is an alternative reading introduced by someone who did not know that Pindar employs the masculine ἄδυτος and not the neuter ἄδυτον.³ The word following ἄδυτον could have been an adjective (e.g. Ἰσμήνιον), or a noun (such as θησαυρόν), or a verb (ἦλθον), and the last is likeliest on grounds of space.⁴ In any case, the second limb of the tricolon seems to complement the first: the

¹ Maehler's *Pa.* VII(a) = Π⁴ fr. VII' (G5); *Pa.* VII(b) = Π⁴ fr. VIII'; *Pa.* VII(c) = Π⁴ fr. IX' (Z1); *Pa.* VII(d) = Π⁴ fr. X'; *Pa.* VII(e) = Π⁴ fr. X' (Z2); *Pa.* VII(f) = Π⁷ fr. 47 (Z9–10).

² For hymnic associations of δοτῆρα see Keyssner (1932), 124–5; Schmitt (1967), 142 ff.

³ *ΣPyth.* 11. 5 (Dr ii. 254. 21) asserts that ἄδυτος is masculine in Pindar (as in *HH Her.* 247), and the damaged Σ to line 3 of this song probably said the same. τελεσσιε[πέος] agreeing with θεοῦ would be possible, except that it is harder to explain variants that differ metrically. Galiano (1950–1), 304 ff., read τελεσσιε[πέος], rejecting the doctrine of masculine ἄδυτος in Pindar. Reminiscent of τελεσσιε[πέος] is the adjective τελεσιερός, which Hesychius attests as being applied to Paian (see p. 48). An interesting parallel from a different culture is the Sumerian epithet *umun duga zida* ('master of the fulfilled speech'), applied to Enlil: see Kutscher (1975), 48.

⁴ The verb: D'Alessio (1988b).

seer gives oracles, but it is the god who brings the words to fulfilment.⁵

(3) ἀγλαάν τ' ἐς αὐλάν | Ὠκεανοῖο[]ν Μελίας. This refers to the sanctuary of Melia, mother of Tenerus and Ismenus, who, as we know from A1. 35, gave birth where the Ismenion was later to be. So at *Pyth.* 11. 4 the singer calls the daughters of Kadmos παρ Μελίαν χρυσέων ἐς ἄδυτον τριπόδων θησαυρόν ('to Melia, to the inviolate treasury of golden tripods').⁶ The name of the mother reminds us of Hesiod's Meliai, the ash-nymphs (*The.* 187), and of his third generation of men, born 'from ash-trees' (*Op.* 145 ἐκ μελιᾶν), the generation before that of the heroes, who included the Seven against Thebes.

After line 4 we have only the left-hand side of the column. Snell suggests that from line 5 the singer describes his arrival, and that ὀριδρόμον refers to his passage over a mountain (the same adjective is used of Bacchants at Eur. *Ba.* 985). This is not the only interpretation possible: ὀριδρόμον could just as easily refer to another deity, e.g. Artemis, who is described as ὀριδρόμος in a fragment of a *Paian* by Simonides. It is even possible that the reference was to Melia, whose name associates her with mountains.⁷

In line 7 σὺν ἀπιομ[ήδ]ει probably forms a complex expression with a preceding noun lost at the end of line 6,⁸ either describing the attitude with which the gods are asked to receive men (we might restore νόω] | σὺν ἀπιομήδει: cf. εὐμενεῖ . . . νόω at D5. 45, with parallels cited there), or the piety and/or artistic accomplishment

⁵ This connection is underscored by the etymology: θεσπεσίων means 'divinely uttered', the first element being related to θεός, the second to the root *seq*°, found in ἐννέπω, ἄσπετος, etc., both elements being present in τελεσσαι[πη] | θεοῦ; cf. the *figura etymologica* at HH *Ap.* 360 θεσπεσίη δ' ἐνοπή γένετ' ἄσπετος ('A divine-spoken, unspeakable speech happened'). θεσπέσιος is commonly used of oracles: Eur. *Andr.* 296; Aesch. *Ag.* 1154-5; Soph. *OT* 463; θέσπεσι in Z3; θεσιόμαντις ('belonging to a divine-speaking seer') in Aristonoos, παιάν, 2.

⁶ See Krummen (1990), 37 n. 10, on the distinction between αὐλή and ἄδυτον; Lehnus (1980), 118 n. 59.

⁷ As in Sim. *PMG* 519 fr. 35(b) 7 and (probably) fr. 37: see Rutherford (1990), 186 n. 63 (the papyrus reading ὀριδρόμον is right, as at *PMG* 519 fr. 37, and ὀρείδρομο[at *PMG* 519 fr. 35 (b) 7 is probably wrong: see Dyck (1989), 3-4; also Fraenkel (1959), 13=(1964), i. 431). Melia (ash-tree) and mountains: see Hom. *Il.* 13. 178; Ar. *Birds*, 742.

⁸ ἀπιομήδης is unique but recognizably a hymnic adjective; parallels are ἡπιόφρων of Asclepius in *IG* ii/2. 4533. 2, 5 (R102), ἡπιόχειρ of Apollo at *AG* 9. 525. 8, ἡπιος of Apollo at Macedonicus, παιάν, 6, 14, 31. On such adjectives see Keyssner (1932), 93 ff.

with which the χορός approach the shrine (in that case one might suggest *παῖανι* | *σὺν ἀπιομήδευι*: cf. D5. 47–8).

No satisfactory interpretation has been offered of line 8. Snell suggests the analysis *-γα νᾶ(ί)ειν*, but the need to posit scribal omission of a letter is a weakness. Turyn printed *γανᾶειν* as one word, which would have to be an uncontracted infinitive of *γανάω*. Thematic verbs in *-α-* generally contract in Pindar, but there is at least one exception in *ναιετάω*, and there is a parallel in *ὑπεργανᾶει* cited in a scholion to the end of D3; the uncontracted infinitive *-ᾶειν* is unparalleled (*-ᾶαν* is the diectasis that would be found in epic), but it seems a permissible formation on the evidence of *ὑπεργανᾶει*.⁹ The meaning would be ‘brighten’ or ‘celebrate’ (a metaphor from polishing a statue?), a sense found in Aeschylus (*Su.* 1019), and also much later in an epigram in honour of Isis from Philae (first century AD?); in the latter text the context is particularly like that of the *Paian*: an army of celebrating soldiers arriving at the sanctuary *νέοις ἐγάνωσεν ἰάχοις* | *Ἐῖσιν* (‘celebrated Isis with new cries’).¹⁰

In line 9 *χέων ῥαθά[μυ]γα* suggests the use of sacred water in sprinkling; this might be part of the self-description (the idea of sprinkling sacred water would adapt itself well to poetry), but it could also refer to a deity who inspires the singer. One is reminded of the use of the *παῖαν* in the context of libation.¹¹

The next point of clarity is in lines 10–12, which are probably part of a self-description. In line 10 the singer perhaps says that he is accompanied by the Kharites, as in D6. 3–4. The self-description continues in line 11, with the mention of *αὐλός* music,¹² and in line 12, with a description of walking along a conspicuous summit. In line 13 we are introduced to the hero Tenerus. After that, in lines 14–15 there is a reference to bulls, probably in the context

⁹ Cf. Chantraine (1958–63), i. 75 ff. *ναιετάω* occurs at *Ol.* 6. 78 and *Nem.* 4. 85.

¹⁰ The epigram is no. 159 in Bernard (1969b), 2. At *Su.* 1019 the *παράδοσις* is *γανᾶεντες*, which has been emended to *γανᾶοντες* (J. C. de Pauw, *Aeschyli Tragodiae* . . . (The Hague, 1745)) or *γανᾶοντες* (J. Sidgwick, *Aeschyli Tragodiae* (Oxford, 1899); see Johansen and Whittle (1980)). Cf. also *γανᾶεντα* χ[at *Dith.* IV (fr. 70d) (*h*) 7 (inconclusive: van der Weiden (1991), 171). The root *γαν-* is discussed by Latacz (1966), 156. *γάνωσις* of a statue: *IG* xi/2. 144; *ID* ii. 461 face A, fr. b34.

¹¹ *ῥαθάμυξ* in the context of poetry: Christodorus, *AG* 2. 110 (of Erinna); *ῥαίνω* at *Pyth.* 8. 57; *Isth.* 6. 21; *Pyth.* 5. 99 ff.; *PMG* 936. 15. The metaphor of water is applied to poetry also at D6. 127 (see p. 325). The word *ῥαθάμυξ* suggests lightness and delicacy, as does *δρόσος* at *Pyth.* 5. 90 ff.; *Isth.* 6. 64; contrast dark, heavy water at *Nem.* 4. 36. See also Call. *Hy.* 2. 108 ff.: Kambylis (1965), 110 ff.

¹² For the *αὐλός* in the context of the *παῖαν* see p. 79.

of a sacrifice, which perhaps took place in front of the altar. The fragment breaks off with a reference to an oracle (line 18).

The title tells us that a Hellenistic commentator inferred that the performers were Thebans, but the parts relating to the place of performance and festival have been lost.¹³ The reference to Tenerus makes us think of Thebes (cf. A 1), though Tenerus was also associated with a broader area, particularly the eponymous Teneric plain to the north-west of Thebes (cf. Pind. fr. 51d), and Strabo 9. 2. 34 implies that he was also associated with the Ptoion. It has been assumed since Wilamowitz that the Ptoion is the most likely venue because of the apparent references to mountains (line 12, perhaps also line 6), which suit the Ptoion but would be harder to reconcile with the Ismenion.¹⁴ The main deity at the Ptoion was Apollo Ptoieus/Ptoios, known to have been worshipped there from the second half of the seventh century BC. It has been suggested that the original seer at the Ptoion was the aptly named hero Ptoios, whose cult is attested, not in the Ptoion itself (modern Perdikovrysi), but at nearby Kastraki; at some point the Thebans might have ousted Ptoios and installed Apollo (now given the title Ptoieus), while the Akraiphnians continued a separate cult of Ptoios nearby. The introduction of Tenerus could have been part of the Theban machinery, and D7 might have had a part in reaffirming Theban control over the Ptoion.¹⁵

This hypothesis is not without its problems.¹⁶ Even without it, D7 could be linked to the Ptoion;¹⁷ but there is a reason for rejecting such a link. Pindar seems to describe the destination as the αὐλή of Melia, but Melia gave birth to Tenerus in the Ismenion (*Pyth.* 11. 4), and even if the cult of Tenerus had moved

¹³ The place of the performance probably followed εἰς as usual; πρὸς perhaps introduced the festival, for example τὰ Ἰσμήνια, or may have been the beginning of προσφιδί[ακός, as D'Alessio suggested.

¹⁴ Ptoion and mountains: Pind. fr. 51b καὶ ποτε τὸν τρικάρανον | Πτωῖον κυθμῶνα κατέσχευε κοῦρος ('And once the youth held the retreat with three peaks which encloses the Ptoion').

¹⁵ Argued by Guillon (1943), 99–115; see Schachter (1981–5), i. 56; (1967), 2 and n. 14.

¹⁶ Commentators have noted in particular that the Akraiphnians were never excluded from the Ptoion: Ducat (1964); Schachter (1981–5), 57, para. 4.

¹⁷ Schachter (1967), 4, also disbelieves the take-over theory, and thinks that 'this may be a poetic way of asserting the fact of Theban control over the Ptoion, by making the legendary prophet of the Ismenion the prophet of the other oracles'; (1981–5), i. 59: 'his presence at the Ptoion may be due solely to Pindar, and might reflect the Theban presence at the sanctuary during the fifth century'.

to the Ptoion, we have no evidence that the cult of Melia moved in the same way. One could argue that the reference to a hill in line 12 suits the Ptoion much better; but the Ismenion was on a hill also (Pausanias calls it a λόφος),¹⁸ and for all we know Pindar could have referred to this as a κορυφή; note that he calls it a σκόπελον in fr. 196: λιπαρᾶν τε Θηβᾶν μέγαν σκόπελον ('great rock of shining Thebes'). If ὀριδρόμον in line 6 refers to the singer, it would be harder to sustain the hypothesis of Theban performance (though not impossible), but we have so little idea of the syntax in lines 6 ff. that we cannot be sure what ὀριδρόμον refers to.

D8 (Pa. VIIc (d))

]αι
] . σσ' ἀμφι[βέ]βακεν[
 Ἀ]πολλων
]σε . ια . . νεμε Λατο[
 5] . . λμαι
]νων
] . νεπε . [. .]νει

Π⁴ fr. 33

2 ἈΣΣ GH (e.g. (ἀν)σσο' or]ας σ' or ᾠσσο'; or]ΛΟC,]ΜΟC (?) suggested by GH: alternatively]ΠΟΛΙΟΝ (GH),]ΙΣΟΜΟΝ (Sn)
 6 or]ΑΙΩΝ

3 Sn, tentatively
 4 Λατο[ῖδας GH

(2-3) he has stood over . . . Apollo! . . .

This and the remaining fragments in Group D could also belong to Group C.

GH restored Ἀ]πολλων,¹ and were reminded of D5, but they concluded that the relative length of the next four lines made it unlikely that the fragment came from there. Although the reading Ἀ]πολλων is uncertain, Λατο[in line 4 makes it likely that the general subject

¹⁸ Paus. 9. 10. 2. For the hill see Demand (1972), 59 ff.

¹ POxy v. 103.

is Apollo. In that case ἀμφι[βέ]βακεν in line 2 might suggest the Homeric description of Apollo's role as a protector of cult sites.²

D9 (*Pa.* VIIc (c))

ν[]εσ[
 ὦ βαθυδ[
 ἰήϊε παῖ με[
 δᾶμον Ἀθα[να

Π⁺ fr. 28

2 AΘ or AE; βαθυδ[οξε GH 3 ἰή ἰε, παῖ με[γίστου Διός Sn 4 or ἄθα[να GH

O deep- . . . *ieios* child . . . people . . .

The words ἰήϊε (or ἰή ἰε) παῖ in line 3 are probably an invocation to Apollo (the fact that the fragment is from a *Paian* itself strongly suggests that, not to mention the Apolline associations of ἰήϊος/ἰή ἰε).¹ SnMae suggest in their apparatus that the rest of the line would have perhaps specified whose son Apollo was (e.g. παῖ με[γίστου Διός).² The only clue as to context is line 4, which probably contains a reference to the people of Athens. The likeliest scenario, perhaps, is that the χορός are calling on Apollo to look after Athens (which makes most sense if it is an Athenian χορός, perhaps visiting Delphi), though there are many other possibilities.³

² Chryse and Cilla in Hom. *Il.* 1. 37, 451; Ismarus in *Od.* 9. 198.

¹ See pp. 13, 25.

² Parallels for the form of the invocation: Sim. *PMG* 575. 1; Pind. *Ol.* 2. 12; Ar. *Kn.* 561; *Thesm.* 129.

³ A couple of other possible Athenian scenarios are worth suggesting. First, according to an aetiology mentioned only in Limenios, *παῖαν*, 11–15 (*CA* 149), Apollo was hailed as *Παῖαν* when he passed through Attica on his way from Delos to Delphi. This could be seen as an alternative Athenian aetiology, designed to anticipate and override the Pytho-tonia aetiology and appropriating the origin of the *παῖαν*-cry for Athens. The myth need not be as late as Limenios, since the idea that Apollo passed through Attica on his way from Delos to Delphi after his birth was ancient when Limenios wrote in the 2nd cent. BC (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 9–11). So D9 might come from a song in which Athenians invoked Apollo as he passed through Attica. Second, Macrobius (*Sat.* 1. 17. 8) gives a variant aetiology of the *παῖαν*-cry in which it originated as encouragement given by the Delphic oracle to Theseus (i.e. 'Shoot, healer') when he was about to go to war with the Amazons (Call. *Hecale* fr. 260. 10 fr. 69. 10 Hollis).

The expression *ἰήϊε παῖ* contains a resonance of a *παιάν*-cry, but it also suggests the aetiological back-formation *ἰε, παῖ*.⁴ There are no contextual indications that D9 comes from a narration of the Pythoctonia. I suggest that Pindar took it for granted that the *παιάν*-cry was derived from *ἰε, παῖ*, and here addresses Apollo in language that is halfway between the *παιάν*-cry and the aetiological back-formation.

| D10 | D11 | D12 |
|----------------------|----------|------------|
|]πι[|]υ[|].[|
|].ια[|] Δάλιο[|]μακάρων [|
|]ἀνθέμω νο[|]υζω.[|]αφορίαν [|
|]οῦ κέλης Ἴονι[- |]ι[| |
| 5]ουν· ὁ[| | |
|]πρι[| | |

Π⁺ fr. 46, 58T

Π⁺ fr. 47

Π⁺ fr. 48, 59T

D10 2 Ἄ ᾀ]μβροσίᾱ[GH, but contrast the shape of the B in the following line
3 ΩΙ ΝΟ[Π⁺: Ω·Ν· ΒΑ Π⁺ (only N is cancelled, but presumably ΒΑ was intended to be
included in the deletion) 4]ΟΚΕ or]ΩΚΑ GH Ἴονι[- GH (not ΤΙ)

D11 βαθ]υζων[GH

D12 3 Π⁺:]αφορίαν Π⁺; νικ]αφορίας, δαφν]αφορίας, στεφαν]αφορίας

D10 Flower . . . horse Ionian.

D12 Of the blessed ones . . . carrying of . . .

In D10 the 'Ionian horse' (if that is what it is) suggests a description of military conflict between Ionians and others, as in the narrative of D2. The reference to 'carrying' in D12 can be compared to S6-2.

D13

Σ (Σ^{ε2}) <?]αλι[| <?]μαντεία[<? | <?]υ[...].[<?

Π⁺ fr. 65

. . . prophecy . . .

⁴ See p. 25.

D14

Σ (Σ^{ε2}) <?]ἀπολογε[ι <?] | <?]ου καὶ θ.[<? | <?]ων
του[<? | <?].[

Π⁴ fr. 70

... defends ...

D13 is a fragment of scholia referring to a prophecy. D14 is a fragment of scholia that included a reference to a defence; naturally, it is tempting to connect this with the ancient hypothesis about the relationship between D6 and *Nemean* 7.

D15

Σ (Σ^{ε2})],ει [|]ρικεσ[]λαιω[| ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος]ς λέγει[

Π⁴ fr. 71 (suppl. GH)

... Pindar says ...

Group E

E1 (*Pa.* VIIc (a))

.....]...[.
].ντενει.
 .π...σ.ειχε...φι...[
 ρυ παρθ[ε]νψ [σ]ὺν πομ[
 5 χ.ν[]ε[]νῆ...θῆρμ[
 Κρό[ν]ιον δῶμ' ἀγλαο[
]ις ἐπ' Ἴσμηγρία[ις
 ...].λω[...].τρ[
]μ[...].ντις αυ.[
 10 ...].[...].υμηδ[.
]ν...θ[
].φορο...[

Π⁴ fr. 26

3 ΑΜΦ, ΔΑΙΦ, or is the first letter after εἶχε deleted? Ν[, Φ[, Δ[εἶχε ἀμφιγν[Sn, but the hiatus is against this; εἶχε Δαιφ, στεῖχε δ' αἰφνιδ[? 4 (beginning of line scarcely legible) ...Θ[ΟΜ[, ΑΛ[, ΑΝ[; πολ[ιαόχψ Turyn 5 (left) ΧΕΙΝ or ΧΟΝ ΝΗΛΕΪ ΘΗΡ Μ[or ΝΗΡΕΪΟΝ ΙΜ[ΕΡ ΓΗ;]ΝΑÇΗ.ΕΪ ΘΗΡ Μ[Sn μ[οι, μ[ε, μ[ιν Sn (because of the accent) 7 ὀχθα]ις e.g. GH 9]Μ rather than]ΑΛ The letter after]Μ could be Η or Α μάντις GH 10 θ]ρ[ασ]υμήδε[Turyn

(4–6) Maiden . . . Kronian home brilliant . . . at the Ismenian . . .

The only real clue is in line 7, which seems to point unambiguously to a Theban context. In that case the μάντις (if that is what it is) in line 9 would be a local Theban seer, perhaps Tenerus. One looks vainly for connections with other *Paianes*. SnMae suggest that lines 4–7 correspond metrically to lines 12–15 of C2, but the correspondence is not close.¹

¹ See p. 456. On E1 see Rutheford (2001).

E2 (*Pa.* VIIc (*b*))

]μ[
]μάτρω[
]οστὰ[

Π⁺ fr. 27

Line 2 probably contained the word *μάτρως*, which Pindar uses in the sense of 'relation on the mother's side' (see Slater (1969*a*), s.v.).

Fragments Not from Π⁴

Group F

Manuscript Fragments and Testimonia

F1 (fr. 61)

τί ἔλπει σοφίαν ἔμμεν, ἂν ὀλίγον τοι
ἀνὴρ ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἴσχει;
οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως τὰ θεῶν
βουλεύματ' ἐρευνάσει βροτέα φρενί·
5 θνατᾶς δ' ἀπὸ ματρὸς ἔφν.

Stob. 2. 1. 8 (ii. 4. 19 Wachsmuth–Hense) supplies lines 1–4; the whole fragment, but an inferior text, in Clem. *Strom.* 5. 14. 129. 3 (iii. 109 Dindorf; ii. 413 Stählin). MSS of Stobaeus are FPL, the MS of Clement is L. Πινδάρου παιάνων (καϊάνων F) ἔτι F, τί F, μί L; παιάνων ἐ' τί Meineke (i.e. in book 5; see §13 n. 1)

1 ἔμμεν Bergk *PLG*⁴ i. 389: εἶναι Stob., omitted by Clement ἂν P² (in the margin):
ᾗ FPL; omitted by Clement ὀλίγον P²L: ὀλίγοι FP¹ 2 ἴσχει L: ἰσχύει FP; ἔχει
Clement 3 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως omitted by Clement 4 Boeckh (1811–19),
iii. 572: ἐρευνᾶσαι Stob., Clement φρενὶ δύσκολον Clement 4–5 Bergk posited
a lacuna, e.g. ὅστις καρπὸν ἀρούρας αἰνυται

What do you suppose wisdom is, that thing whereby one man obtains some slight edge over another? It is not possible that with a mortal heart he will discover the plans of the gods. He is of mortal mother.

As the text stands, ἀνὴρ, the subject in the subordinate clause in lines 1–2, has to be supplied as the subject in lines 3–5. This is slightly abrupt. Bergk suggested supplying a subject in a general relative clause lost between lines 4 and 5.¹ A bolder solution would be to emend the third-person forms to second-person forms. The

¹ Bergk, *PLG*⁴ i. 389, cited in the apparatus.

references to wisdom remind us of A1 and C2; the verb *ἐρευνάω* is actually used in a similar context in C2. 20. The idea of mortal ignorance contrasted with immortal knowledge seems typical of the genre.²

F2 (fr. 58)

Δωδῶνι δισσῶν ἐκ πελειάδων· τὴν ἐν Δωδώνῃ τῆς Θεσπρωτίας
 φηγόν, ἐφ' ἣ δύο περιστεραι καθήμεναι ἐμαντεύοντο· ὡς ἀπ' εὐ-
 θείας δὲ τῆς Δωδῶν, ὡς Πλευρών. "Ομηρος δὲ Δωδώνην εἶπεν.
 εἰς τὸ αὐτό. ὑπεράνω τοῦ ἐν Δωδώνῃ μαντείου δύο ἦσαν πέλειαι,
 δι' ὧν ἐμαντεύετο ὁ Ζεὺς, ὡς Ἀπόλλων ἀπὸ τρίποδος. οἱ μὲν 5
 οὕτω λέγουσι θεσπίζειν, οἱ δὲ οὕτω, τὰς ἱερείας γραίας οὔσας. καὶ
 γὰρ τοὺς γέροντας οἱ Μολοσσοὶ πελείους ὀνομάζουσιν. Ἡρόδοτος
 δὲ ἐν β' φησί· πελειάδες δέ μοι δοκέουσι κεκληθῆναι πρὸς Δω-
 δωναίων αἱ γυναῖκες, διότι βάρβαροι οὔσαι, ἐδόκουν ὁμοίως ὄρνισι
 φθέγγεσθαι· μετὰ δὲ χρόνον δοκοῦσιν ἀνθρωπίνῃ φωνῇ φθέγγε- 10
 σθαι . . . ἐπεὶ περ ἐκ Θηβῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἦσαν. Εὐριπίδης δὲ τρεῖς
 γεγονέναι φησὶν αὐτάς, οἱ δὲ δύο, καὶ τὴν μὲν εἰς Λιβύην ἀφικέσθαι
 Θήβηθεν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἄμμωνος χρηστήριον, τὴν <δὲ εἰς τὸ> περὶ τὴν
 Δωδώνην, ὡς καὶ Πίνδαρος Παιᾶσι.

ΣSoph. *Tra.* 172 (154–5 Elmsley; 290 Papageorgiou)

7 *πελείους* R. F. P. Bruck, *Sophocles* (Strasburg, 1789), iii. 203 (cf. Hesych. iii. 300–1 Schmidt); *πολιούς* MSS (cf. Strabo 7 fr. 1a); *πελιούς* Papageorgiou (cf. Herodian 1. 123. 16 Lentz) 8 ff. NB in Herodotus (2. 57) only one Theban dove migrates to Dodona 11 In Her. the fact that the dove came from Egypt explains why people called it black; the Σ misses out the intervening thought

From the two doves at Dodona. The oak at Dodona in Thesprotia, on which two doves sat and prophesied. It is formed as if from a nominative *Δωδών*, like *Πλευρών*; Homer uses *Δωδώνη*. On the same line: above the oracle in Dodona there were two doves, which Zeus used to prophesy, as Apollo prophesied from the tripod. Some say that he prophesied in this way, others that the priestesses were old women, since the Molossians call old

² Compare also the idea of mortal dependence in Ariphron's *παιάν* to Health (*PMG* 813); related also may be the statement of mortal ignorance and divine knowledge in ant. B of the first stasimon of Soph. *OT* (line 498), where the context is perhaps not dissimilar to that of a *παιάν*.

people *πῆλαιοι*. Herodotus says in his second book (2. 57): 'I believe that the women were called doves by the inhabitants of Dodona because they were barbarians and their voices sounded like birds; after a time they seemed to speak with a human voice . . . since they were from Thebes in Egypt.' Euripides says that there were three of them, others say that there were two, and that one came from Thebes to the oracle of Ammon in Libya, while the other went to the area of Dodona. Pindar also gave this version in his *Paianes*.

A common aetiology linked the oracles of Zeus at Dodona and of Zeus Ammon in the Siwa oasis, deriving both from Egyptian Thebes. Herodotus (2. 54-7) distinguishes two versions: according to the first, related to him (he claims) by the priests of Egyptian Thebes, the cults in Dodona and Siwa were founded by two priestesses who were carried off from Egyptian Thebes by Phoenicians; according to the second, deriving from Dodona, the new foundations were established by two black doves which flew from Egyptian Thebes.¹ The scholion says that Pindar mentioned this myth also, thus anticipating Herodotus. It is a reasonable supposition that the version he mentioned was the one with the doves. Other references to Egypt in Pindar contain an element of the fantastic. For example, he explained the flood of the Nile as controlled by the feet of a colossus bestriding it (fr. 267). In a *Prosodion* (fr. 91) he described how the gods, threatened by Typhon (= Seth), once fled to Egypt, assuming the shape of animals. And he reports that at Mendes women mated with goats (fr. 201).² Besides, birds were given a role by Pindar in the aetiology of Delphi (H1), so their appearance is plausible in the present context.

Concerning the oracle at Siwa, the myth seems to reflect a true tradition of Egyptian foundation. Ammon is Amun-Ra ('Imn-R'), chief god of the Egyptian pantheon, whose principal seat was at Egyptian Thebes.³ The secondary foundation at Siwa came very late by Egyptian standards, and was probably in part a strategic move to deal with the threat of Libya, or perhaps even Cyrene (founded in 640 BC).⁴ In having an oracle, the cult at Siwa imitated

¹ Fehling (1971), 50-4 (= translation, 65); Parke (1967), 52 ff.; Lloyd (1976), 252 ff. Sil. Ital. 3. 675-91 seems to imply that the doves start from Thebes in Greece; also Servius on *Aen.* 3. 466 (i. 423. 16 Thilo-Hagen). See Cook (1914-40), i. 364.

² Fr. 282 is put in context by Bonneaux (1964), 230 etc. Fr. 91 is discussed by Griffith (1960). Bowra (1964), 371 ff., discusses Pindar's connections with Egypt.

³ Her. 2. 42; Parke (1967), 194 ff.

⁴ Her. 2. 42 says that the Libyan cult was founded by Egyptian and Ethiopian

the mother cult at Egyptian Thebes, which also boasted one, at least in the New Kingdom.⁵

The part of the myth that concerns Dodona is less reliable. The Greek appropriation of the cult as the oracle of Zeus Ammon was probably a consequence of the foundation of Cyrene, and the opening up of Libya that ensued. Thus, the Greek cult spreads from Siwa and not from Egyptian Thebes. The earliest evidence for Cyrenaean contact with Ammon is in the form of coinage; a magnificent Doric temple of Zeus Ammon was probably built at the end of the sixth century BC. From Cyrene the cult seems to have found its way back to the Peloponnese. We know of cults in Sparta, Gytheum, Olympia, and also Thebes, where Pindar is supposed to have put up an *ἄγαλμα* of Zeus Ammon by the sculptor Calamis. (Pindar had perhaps encountered Ammon in his dealings with Cyrene—he refers to the god in two *Epinikia* written for Cyrenaean patrons, *Pyth.* 4. 16 and 9. 53.⁶)

The aetiology itself is evidence that Ammon was also known at Dodona. Besides that, a bronze head of Zeus Ammon, now in the Louvre, dated to the fifth century BC, probably comes from there. However, there seems to have been no special link between Dodona and Egyptian Thebes or Siwa. The aetiology was probably motivated by a desire to link the most prominent oracles of Zeus/Amun/Ammon. It may also have exploited certain features which to Greek perception seemed to be shared by the oracles of Dodona and Siwa but to be absent in the case of other well-known Greek oracles, such as Delphi.⁷ The tradition that doves carried the cult

colonists, which may date the settlement to the Ethiopian XXVth dynasty (late 8th or early 7th cent. BC). Archaeological remains date to the XXVIth dynasty (7th–6th cent. BC) or the XXIXth dynasty (early 4th cent. BC); see Bisi (1985), 571. Fakhri (1973), 78–9, conjectures that the cult might have originated around the XXIst dynasty (11th cent. BC), when the Theban cult of Amun was at the height of its power.

⁵ See L. Kákossy, in *LÄ* iv. 600; Černý (1962); Parke (1967), 195.

⁶ Cyrene: Malkin (1987), 60, with references cited there. Coinage: Parke (1967), 202; Head (1911), 866 ff.; Bisi (1985). Temple of Zeus Ammon: Chamoux (1953), 320 ff. Ammon in Greece: Paus. 3. 18. 3 (Sparta); 3. 21. 8 (Gythium); 5. 15. 11 (Olympia). The dissemination of the cult in the Greek world is discussed by Classen (1959); J. Lechant and G. Clerc in *LIMC* i/1. 666 ff. Statue of Calamis: Paus. 9. 16. 1; on the statue see *LIMC* i/1. 684(b) and (speculatively) Dörig (1965), 200 ff.; also Parke (1967) 207.

⁷ Bronze head: *LIMC* i/1, no. *88 (=Louvre 4235), discussed by Parke (1967), 208, 238 n. 23. Symbols: Strabo 7. 7. 11; fr. 1a; Cook (1914–40), i. 369. Pools: Pliny, *NH* 2. 228, 5. 31.

from Thebes to Siwa and Dodona is perhaps a blending of Egyptian and Greek traditions. On the one hand, it has been argued that it may reflect the Egyptian tradition that the dead Osiris was searched for by Isis and Nephthys in the form of birds. On the other hand, the choice of the doves was probably motivated by a feature of the Dodonean cult, not only because Herodotus specifies that this detail was peculiar to the Dodonean version of the myth, but also because there is some evidence to suggest that the Dodonean priestesses were traditionally referred to as 'doves' (πελειάδες or πέλειαι).⁸

The myth is highly flattering to Dodona, providing an international status not inferior to that of Delphi. It is analogous to the Delphic myths of Cretan colonization and of the eagles and the ὀμφαλός (see H1). Note, however, that while the myth of the eagles justifies Delphi's claim to be the centre of the world, it is rather their remoteness and inaccessibility which Dodona and the cult of Ammon in the Siwa oasis have in common.

Snell followed Boeckh in grouping F2 with other Pindaric fragments relating to Dodona.⁹ It could just as easily have come from the song that Pindar is known to have composed in honour of Zeus Ammon, of which fr. 36 Ἀμμων Ὀλύμπου δέσποτα ('Ammon, master of Olympus') was probably the first line. (That song is generally grouped with the *Hymnoi* because Pausanias designates a Pindaric song in honour of Zeus Ammon as a ὕμνος, but he might be using the word in its general sense.) If Pindar intended the song primarily for the cult of Ammon in Boeotian Thebes, as Wilamowitz suggested, the reference to Egyptian Thebes would have special point.¹⁰ The possibility that Dodona was mentioned in a Theban song makes us think of the *τριποδηφορικὰ μέλη* which Proclus claims accompanied the sacred transportation of tripods from Thebes to

⁸ Isis and Nephthys: Kuhlmann (1988), 53–6. In ancient Egypt birds as messengers on occasions of divine crowning and celebration of victory: Keel (1977), 109 ff. A Sumerian priestess could be called a bird: see Westenholz (1989), 544. Priestesses at Dodona: Park (1967), 62 ff.; Bodson (1978), 101 ff.; R. C. Jebb, ed. *Soph. Tra.* (Cambridge, 1892), 202 ff. The application of a bird's name to the priestesses recalls the Delphic μέλισσαι (Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 60 with Braswell ad loc.). Even if πέλειος/πέλητος/πελλᾶς was a local word for 'old man' (Strabo 7, fr. 1a, and Hesych. iii. 300, 301 Schmidt; *DELG* iii. 786, referring to *IGLS* iv. 1261 with Roussel (1942)), it is unlikely to be the explanation.

⁹ Following Boeckh (1811–19), iii. 571, SnMae link it with fr. 57 Δωδωναίε μεγασθενές and S8 (fr. 59), which refers to Dodona.

¹⁰ SnMae fr. 36, from *SPind. Pyth.* 9. 53 (Dr ii. 228. 20); Paus. 9. 16. 1; Parke (1967), 206–7; Wilamowitz (1922), 379 n. 1.

Dodona.¹¹ Alternatively, the common aetiology of the sanctuaries might have been commemorated by (unattested) pilgrimages by *θεωροί* from Ammon to Dodona and/or vice versa, and it is possible that the performance of Pindar's song accompanied these.

Either of these hypotheses suggests that one of the Pindaric *Pai-anes* was dedicated to Zeus. We can compare the *παιάνες* in honour of Olympian Zeus and Zeus Soter that accompanied libations of wine at the Greek *συμπόσιον*, and also Hesychius' claim that Zeus was worshipped as *Παίαν* in Rhodes. Perhaps such a song would have contained a regular refrain in which Zeus was invoked under the epithets *σωτήρ* and *παιάν* (along the lines of what I have called the syncretizing refrain of Philodamus' *παιάν* to Dionysus).¹²

But these are not the only possibilities. Since the other two references to Zeus Ammon in Pindar come in *Epinikia* composed for Cyrenaean patrons, F2 could be from a Cyrenaean composition also. Such a song need not have been dedicated to Zeus Ammon, since an account of the origin of this important Cyrenaean cult could have been well motivated in a song the primary purpose of which was to celebrate the cult of Apollo Karneios (cf. *Pyth.* 5. 77 ff., or Callimachus' quasi-paeanic *Hymn to Apollo*). In such a song the point of the myth of the doves could have been to reinforce Cyrene's connection with Greek traditions by suggesting that the relationship was bilateral: on the one hand, Cyrene was a Greek colony, but on the other the cult of Zeus Ammon which she had patronized was one that had contributed to Greek civilization.

F3 (fr. 66)

Θηβαῖοι καὶ Θηβαγενεῖς διαφέρουσιν καθὼς Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνή-
ματι τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου φησίν· “καὶ τὸν τρίποδα
ἀπὸ τοῦτου Θηβηγενεῖς πέμπουσι τὸν χρύσειον εἰς Ἰσμηνίου πρῶ-
τον.” τίς δ’ ἐστὶ διαφορὰ Θηβαγενῶν πρὸς Θηβαίους, “Εφορος ἐν
τῇ δευτέρᾳ φησίν· “οὗτοι μὲν οὖν συνετάχθησαν εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν. 5
τοὺς δὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ὁμόρους προσοικούντας ἰδίᾳ Θηβαῖοι προσ-
ηγάγοντο πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ὕστερον, οἱ σύμμικτοι μὲν ἦσαν πολ-

¹¹ Procl. *Chrest.* 321^b33 *τριποδηφορικὸν μέλος*; ΣDion. Thrax 450. 19–20 Hilgard; see also p. 429. The sources do not specify such songs by Pindar, but they are likely to have existed in view of the influence that the poet must have exerted on the typology of lyric genres followed by Proclus.

¹² See pp. 131–5.

λαχόθεν, ἐνέμοντο δὲ τὴν ὑπὸ τὸν Κιθαιρώνα χώραν καὶ τὴν ἀπεναντίον τῆς Εὐβοίας· ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ Θηβαγενεῖς, ὅτι προσεγένοντο τοῖς ἄλλοις Βοιωτοῖς διὰ Θηβαίων.”

Amm. *De adf. diff. verb.* 231 Nickau (Leipzig, 1966) = Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 21; Didymus 2. 5. 58, 238–9 Schmidt. (This is the only fragment that survives from Didymus' multi-volume ὑπόμνημα on Pindar's *Paianes*.)

MSS of Ammonius GCEM (Nickau, p. lxxv) 2 τοῦ πρώτου Wil 3 Ἰσμηνίου
L. C. Valckenaer, *Ammonius* (Leiden, 1739): Ἰσμηνὸν MSS 7 ὕστερον {δέ}
MSS 8 τὸν Κιθαιρώνα G: τῶν κιθαιρῶν CEM 8–9 ἀπεναντίον anon. in
Valckenaer: ἀπομάντιον MSS

Thebans and Thebes-born differ according to Didymus in his first commentary on the *Paianes* of Pindar: 'And the Thebes-born send the golden tripod to the Ismenion first as a result of this.' As to the difference between Thebes-born and Thebans, Ephorus says in his second book: 'The latter were federated into Boeotia, while the former enjoyed independence on the border with Attica, until many years later the Thebans annexed them. They were a mixed race from many sources, and inhabited the country below Cithaeron and the land opposite Euboea; their name was "Thebes-born", because it was owing to the Thebans that they amalgamated with the rest of Boeotia.'

All we know from this is that Didymus said that the Thebageneis, a community dwelling in the south of Boeotia and federated with the Boeotians, sent tripods to Thebes.¹ The lemma in the Pindaric *Paian* that occasioned this comment could have been a reference to the Thebageneis, but it might have been merely a reference to tripods in the Ismenion; so at *Pyth.* 11. 5 a reference to tripods in the Ismenion motivates a similar comment.² Thus, we do not know that the ritual in which the Thebageneis sent tripods to Thebes was the occasion of the song, or that the aetiology of the ritual was the song's theme, and SnMae are guessing when they preface the song with the hypothetical title <ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΤΡΙΠΟΔΗΦΟΡΙΚΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΙΣΜΗΝΙΟΝ> (*For The Thebans to the Ismenion a Tripodephorikon*). What we can be reasonably sure of is that Didymus was commenting

¹ See Schachter (1981–94), i. 82–3. The form Θηβαγενής is used first at Hes. *The.* 530 of Heracles; contrast Θηβαιγενής at Eur. *Supp.* 135. For the difference between the two forms see Bona (1988), 326–7.

² Dr ii. 255. 5 ἐν τῷ Ἰσμηνίῳ πολλὰς ἀνακεῖσθαι τρίποδας· οἱ γὰρ Θηβαγενεῖς ἐτριποδοφόρου ἐκεῖσε ('In the Ismenion many tripods are dedicated. For the Thebageneis carry tripods there').

on a Theban song, and it is even possible that it was one of the partially extant Theban *Paianes* (A1 or D7).

F4 (fr. 68)

μόρσιμον υἱόν· τὸν Οἰδίπουν, καθὼ μοῖραν ἐπήνεγκε τῷ πατρὶ
Λαΐῳ. ἐν δὲ τοῖς παιᾶσιν εἴρηται περὶ τοῦ χρησμοῦ τοῦ ἐκπεσόντος
Λαΐῳ, καθὰ καὶ Μνασέας ἐν τῷ περὶ χρησμῶν γράφει· “Λαΐε Λαβ-
δακίδη ἀνδρῶν περιώνυμε πάντων”.

ΣPind. *Ol.* 2. 38 (Dr i. 78. 5-9) = Mnaseas of Patara, *Περὶ χρησμῶν*, *FHG* iii. 157 fr. 47 = fr. 372 Parke-Wormell

Fated son: Oedipus, since he brought fate upon his father Laius. In the *Paianes* there is a reference to an oracle which was issued to Laius, as Mnaseas writes in his *On Oracles*: ‘Laius, son of Labdacus, famous among all men.’

Although the crucial expression ἐν τοῖς παιᾶσιν refers to a *ὑπόμνημα* on the *Paianes* rather than the *Paianes* themselves, the fact that the *ὑπόμνημα* contained such a reference suggests that there was one in the *Paianes*.¹ The song in question could well have been a Theban one, but we have no idea about the context. The oracle would be appropriate to a *παιάν*. Snell suggested a connection with fr. 177(d), one of several lines in a quasi-iambic metre cited by Priscian, which seems to be about the Sphinx.²

F5 (fr. 67)

περὶ δὲ τῆς Δωρισιτὶ ἀρμονίας εἴρηται ἐν παιᾶσιν ὅτι Δώριον μέλος
σεμνότατόν ἐστι.

ΣPind. *Ol.* 1. 17 (Dr i. 26. 19)

With reference to the Dorian ἀρμονία, it is said in the *Paianes* that the Dorian melody is the most solemn.

¹ On the force of the expression ἐν τοῖς παιᾶσιν (found also in F5, F6, F7) see Käppel (1992a). ² On the metre of fr. 177 see Pretagostini (1977), 67-8.

I discuss other evidence for the correlations between ἀρμονίαι and genres in Part I.¹

F6 (fr. 70)

ἐν γὰρ τῷ Κηφισσῷ οἱ αὐλητικοὶ κάλαμοι φύονται· εἴρηται δὲ καὶ ἐν παιᾷσι περὶ αὐλητικῆς.

ΣPind. *Pyth.* 12. 25 (Dr ii. 268. 19)

Reeds for αὐλοὶ grow in the Kephissus. Reference is made to αὐλός music in the *Paianes*.

It is unclear whether this is a specific reference or a general recognition of the fact that the αὐλός tends to be mentioned in the context of παιᾶνες.²

F7 (fr. 69)

ἐν Πυθοῖ· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἡ Ἀπολλωνία νάπη, περὶ ἧς ἐν παιᾷσιν εἴρηται.

ΣPind. *Pyth.* 6. 5c (Dr ii. 195. 1)

In Pytho: the glades of Apollo, which are referred to in the *Paianes*, are there.

This seems to be an entirely general reference.

F8 (fr. 62)

πωτᾶτ' ἄλκυνονὶς λιγυρῇ ὅπῃ θεσπίζουσα
λῆξιν ὀρινομένων ἀνέμων· συνέηκε δὲ Μόψος

¹ See p. 80.

² Snell associates with this fr. 249b (*POxy* ii. 64: Ammonius on Hom. *Il.* 21. 195) πρόσθα μὲν Ἶς Ἀχελωΐου τὸν αἰδοτάτον | Εὐρωπία κράνα Μέλ[α]ν[ι]ός τε {ποταμοῦ} ῥοαὶ | τρέφον κάλαμον ('Previously, the force of the Acheloos, the fountain of the Europos, and the streams of the Melas nurtured the most tuneful reed'). This connection is based on the clause ἐν γὰρ τῷ Κηφισσῷ οἱ αὐλητικοὶ κάλαμοι φύονται, but the scope of the reference to the *Paian* is αὐλητικῆ, not κάλαμοι.

ἄκταίης ὄρνιθος ἐναΐσιμον ὄσσαν ἀκούσας.

εἴληφε δὲ τὰ περὶ τῶν ἀλκυνόνων παρὰ Πινδάρου ἐκ παιᾶνων·
εὐλόγως δὲ ὄσσαν εἶπε τὴν τῆς ἀλκυνόνης φωνήν· ὑπὸ γὰρ Ἡρας 5
ἦν ἀπεσταλμένη, ὥς φησι Πίνδαρος.

A.R. 1. 1085 ff. with Σ at 96. 7 ff. Wendel

τὴν τῶν ἀλκυνόνων φωνήν L. de Nopa, *editio princeps*; τὴν ἀλκυνόνην L(aurentianus); τὴν ἀλκυνόνα P(arisinus)

The halcyon flew, prophesying with shrill voice | the cessation of the rising winds. Mopsus understood | when he heard the fateful voice of the shore-bird. He has taken the passage about the halcyons from Pindar's *Paianes*. He has been clever in calling the voice of the halcyon ὄσσα, for it was sent by Hera, as Pindar says.

The interpretation of a bird sign by a prophet is quite normal; what is unusual about this passage is that the bird is said to prophesy and to have a voice (ὄσσα). The scholiast is particularly interested in the fact that Apollonius called the voice of the bird ὄσσα, which Homer uses in the sense of 'divine rumour'.¹ The scholiast thinks this is an appropriate extension, since in the Pindaric *Paian* the halcyon was sent by Hera. There is no suggestion that Pindar used the word ὄσσα in this connection, or that he mentioned Mopsus, or even that his reference to the halcyon came in the context of the Argonauts. This fragment should clearly count as an instance of themes of prophecy in the *Paianes*; in particular it can be compared to the prophesying doves in F2.²

F9 (fr. 64)

τοιγάροι Πλάτων ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῆς Πολιτείας (398 E) δυσχεραίνει
τῇ τοιαύτῃ μουσικῇ· τὴν γοῦν Λύδιον ἀρμονίαν παραιτεῖται, ἐπει-
δὴ ὀξεία καὶ ἐπιτήδειος πρὸς θρῆνον. ἥ καὶ τὴν πρώτην σύστασιν

¹ Hom. *Il* 2. 93; *Od*. 24. 413.

² Turyn connects this with a tradition that Pindar wrote a song in honour of Glaucus Pontius (fr. 263 SnMae=Paus. 9. 22. 7), citing Philostr. *Im*. 2. 15 (not attributed to Pindar) for the tradition that Glaucus Pontius accompanied by halcyons prophesied to the Argonauts. For the general role of birds as a weather sign see e.g. Hes. *Op*. 448, with Bodson (1978), 94 ff.

αὐτῆς φασι θρηνώδη τινὰ γενέσθαι. "Ολυμπον γὰρ πρῶτον Ἀριστό-
 ξενος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ μουσικῆς ἐπὶ τῷ Πύθωνί φησιν ἐπικηδεῖον 5
 αὐλῆσαι Λυδιστί. εἰσὶν δ' οἱ Μελανιππίδην τούτου τοῦ μέλους
 ἄρξαι φασίν. Πίνδαρος δ' ἐν παιᾶσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς Νιόβης γάμοις φησὶ
 Λύδιον ἁρμονίαν πρῶτον διδαχθῆναι, ἄλλοι δὲ Τόρηβον πρῶτον τῇ
 ἁρμονίᾳ χρῆσασθαι, καθάπερ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἰαμβος ἱστορεῖ.

Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1136 c (Aristoxenus, fr. 80)

So Plato in the third book of the *Republic* (398 E) expresses irritation at this sort of music. He rejects the Lydian ἁρμονία, on the grounds that it is high-pitched and suited to lamentation. Thus they say that the first formation of it was threnetic. Aristoxenus in the first book of his *On Music* says that the first composition in the Lydian ἁρμονία was a lament on the αὐλός by Olympus commemorating the death of Python. Some say that Melanippides invented this form of melody. Pindar in his *Paianes* says that the Lydian ἁρμονία was first performed on the occasion of the marriage of Niobe. Others say that Torebus was the first to employ this ἁρμονία, and Dionysius Iambus tells the same story.

This source tells us that one of Pindar's *Paianes* related the wedding of Niobe (presumably to Amphion) and the 'first performance' there of the Lydian ἁρμονία. It does not say who 'first performed' the Lydian ἁρμονία. In the nineteenth century it was fashionable to supplement the text of pseudo-Plutarch on the basis of Pollux 4. 79, which says that the Lydian ἁρμονία was invented by a certain Anthippus; thus Bergk and others suggested adding ὑπ' Ἀνθίππου after διδαχθῆναι. But it seems unreasonable to presume that there was only one tradition about the origin of the Lydian ἁρμονία, and in any case it is not easy to see how a reference to Anthippus, who seems to have been a historical poet, could have been worked into a mythological narrative.¹ It seems more likely that knowledge of the Lydian ἁρμονία was transmitted to men by a god, since the gods are likely to have attended this wedding, as they did the wedding of Peleus and Thetis.

It can be argued that from the wedding of Niobe Pindar probably went on to relate the killing of her children by Apollo and Artemis. That hypothesis suits the genre, because we would expect a παιάν

¹ PLG¹ 224; Volkmann (1856), 100–1; PLG⁴ iii. 592–3; PLG⁵ 405.

to be largely concerned with Apollo and his family.² We know that Pindar somewhere said that the Niobids numbered twenty, and that detail may very well come from this song.³ It could be objected that whereas we would expect a *παιάν* to praise Apollo, the killing of the Niobids was an episode that portrayed him and his sister as perpetrators of unforgiving revenge; but this impression could have been balanced by emphasis on the transgression of Niobe.⁴

If the song included the killing of the Niobids, it is perhaps worth looking again at the Lydian *ἄρμονία*. The tradition that Olympus composed an *ἐπικηγήειον* in the Lydian *ἄρμονία* mourning the death of Python strongly suggests that the *ἄρμονία* had a threnetic quality. In that case, perhaps its performance at Niobe's wedding was a sign of the disaster that was later to befall her progeny.⁵

F10

generum vero pro marito positum multi accipiunt iuxta Sappho, quae in libro, qui inscribitur *ἐπιθαλάμια*, ait (PLF fr. 116) *χαῖρε, νύμφα, χαῖρε, τίμιε γάμβρε, πολλά ἀντὶ τοῦ νυμφίε*. sic et Pindarus *ἐν τοῖς παιᾶσιν*.

Servius on Virg. *Georg.* 1. 31 (iii/1. 139. 26 Thilo-Hagen)

ἐν τοῖς Ἰσθμίοις Daniel (1600) (thinking of *Isthm.* 6. 25?)

Many understand *gener* in the sense of *maritus* in accordance with Sappho, who says in the book which is entitled *ἐπιθαλάμια*: 'Rejoice, bride, rejoice greatly, honoured son-in-law', instead of 'bridegroom'. So too Pindar in the *Paianes*.

Pindar uses *γάμβρός* in the transferred sense of 'bridegroom' also at *Pyth.* 9. 116. We are given no clue as to the context, though the association between *παιᾶνες* and weddings is probably relevant.

² For the association between Niobe and the *παιάν* cf. Call. *Hy.* 2. 22 ff., cited on p. 122; Rutherford and Naiden (1996).

³ See Aelian, *VH* 12. 36; Gell. 20. 7; ΣBacch. fr. 20b (see Maehler (1970), 102, apparatus).

⁴ One might compare the balance between Apollonian violence and the transgression of Neoptolemus at the end of the second triad of D6.

⁵ For the Lydian *ἄρμονία* see Abert (1899), 92 ff. D'Alessio (1997), 43–4, has now suggested a link between F9 and S9.

Snell suggested a link with F9, which is likely enough, but I see no reason to follow him in associating either fragment with S5.

F11

conclamant socii laetum paeana secuti. paeon proprie Apollinis laus est, sed abusive etiam aliorum dicitur; unde Pindarus opus suum, quod et hominum et deorum continet laudes, paeanas vocavit.

Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 10. 738 (ii. 464. 1 Thilo–Hagen). This fragment is omitted by Maehler

His comrades shouted the happy παιάν following him. The παιάν is properly praise of Apollo, but it is also used imprecisely of praise of others. Whence Pindar called his work, which contains the praises of both men and gods, *Paeans*.

Servius comments on the passage in Virgil where Mezentius has just slain Orontes, and his comrades strike up a victory παιάν (Virgil is presumably thinking of Hom. *Il.* 22. 391). Servius' note is elucidated by a passage from Proclus' taxonomy of Greek lyric poetry in which a distinction is drawn between four major categories of poetry: songs εἰς θεούς, songs εἰς ἀνθρώπους, songs that are both εἰς θεούς and εἰς ἀνθρώπους, and songs εἰς τὰς προσπιπτούσας περιστάσεις.¹ For Proclus the παιάν belongs in the first category, εἰς θεούς. F11, on the other hand, seems to be a fragment of an alternative classification, in which the παιάν belongs to the mixed category. This point is particularly clear if one compares the phraseology used by Proclus to describe the mixed category:²

εἰς θεοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπους παρθένια, δαφνηφορικά, τριποδ)ηφορικά, ὠσχοφορικά, εὐκτικά· ταῦτα γὰρ εἰς θεοὺς γραφόμενα καὶ ἀνθρώπων περιείληφεν ἐπαίνους.

Dedicated to gods and men: *Parthenia*, *Daphnephorika*, *Tripodephorika*, *Oskhophorika*, *Euktika*. These, while being dedicated to the gods, also contain praise of men.

The phrase ἀνθρώπων περιείληφεν ἐπαίνους here corresponds exactly to Servius' 'hominum . . . continet laudes', and we can take it that

¹ Procl. *Chrest.* 319^b35–320^a9; see p. 102.

² Procl. *Chrest.* 320^a3–6.

Servius or his source has translated a similar Greek sketch of the genre. (Another common point between Servius and Proclus is the word *abusive*, which translates *καταχρηστικῶς* in Proclus' account of the *παίαν* (*Chrest.* 320^a24), though for Proclus the 'misuse' is not the general broadening of the scope of the genre to cover all deities, but rather a secondary broadening to make it synonymous with *προσόδια*.) As a statement about the genre, Servius' testimony makes sense, since from the early Hellenistic period the traditional dedication of *παῖνες* to deities such as Apollo and Asclepius was increasingly supplemented by the practice of dedicating them to powerful men.

The implication that Pindar applied the term *Paianes* to a certain group of songs, and that these songs were even grouped together as an *opus* in Pindar's time, seems to represent a misunderstanding of the role of Hellenistic scholarship in organizing the songs.³ It is another question whether Servius' statement reflects knowledge of the Hellenistic edition. This issue depends partly on what 'contains the praises of men' means. If it implies dedication, it does not seem to describe the *Paianes* very well, because only one is dedicated to a hero or man—D2. In that case, perhaps Servius or his source is mistaken, falsely attributing to Pindar the later practice of dedicating *παῖνες* to men as well as gods. However, other *Paianes* contained narratives describing the exploits of heroes (D4–7), and it is possible that 'containing the praises of men' refers to this. In that case, perhaps Servius does reflect knowledge of the *Paian*-book; it is even possible, as I suggested earlier, that 'praises of gods' and 'praises of men' were the two major categories in the organization of the book.⁴

³ As was noticed by Boeckh: see §15 n. 1.

⁴ See p. 160.

Group G

Papyrus Fragments Perhaps from *Paianes*

Group G comprises fragments from papyri other than Π⁴ that may come from *Paianes*. These are G₁ and G₂ from Π⁷, G₃ from Π²⁸, G₄ from Π²⁶, G₅ from Π⁵, G₆–7 from Π⁴⁵, G₈–9 from Π¹¹, and G₁₀–11 from Π³⁴.

G1 (*Pa.* XII)

[Ναξιτοις ~5]με[~6]ωνιο[
 εις Δῆλον] ...] .οισιν ἐννέ[α Μοί]σαις
 μ]άλα δ' Ἀρτέμιδ[ος Λα]τῳῖον, Ἀσ[τερία,
 λῆ]χος ἀμφέπο[ισ' ἄν]θεα τοιᾶ[σ-
 5 δ'] ὑμνήσιος δρέπη· θαμὰ δ' ἔρ[χεται
 Να]ξόθεν λιπαροτρόφων θυσί[α
 μῆ]λων Χαρίτεσσι μίγδαν
 Κύ]νθιον παρὰ κρημνόν, ἔνθα [~?
 κελαινεφέ' ἀργιβρένταν λέγο[ντι ~?
 10 Ζῆνα καθεζόμενον
 κορυφαῖσιν ὕπερθε φυλάξαι π[ρ]ονοί[α, ~?
 ἀνί]κ' ἀγανόφρων
 Κοίου θυγάτηρ λύετο τερπνᾶς
 > ὠδίνος· ἔλαμψαν δ' αἰλίου δέμας ὅπω[ς ~?
 15 ἀγλαὸν ἐς φάος ἰόντες δίδυμοι
 παῖδες, πολὺν ῥόθ[ο]ν ἔεσαν ἀπὸ στομ[άτων
 'Ε]λείθυιά τε καὶ Ἀά[χ]εσις· τελε[αι δ' ολ] ~?
 κα]τελάμβανον [. . .]
 ..]εφθέγξαντο δ' ἐχχώρια
 20 ἀγ]λαὸς ᾧς ἀν' ἐρκε[. . .]
 ...] .αραντοταρακταινοντοχ[. . .]
 ~6].[~6].ι φυγον ἀνδρα[
 ~14]ηρεσορ[. . .]
 24 ~14]...[
 25? ~17]φα.[

| | | | |
|-----|------------|---|------------|
| ~14 |]ανευ.ει[| ⋮ |] |
| ~14 |]μολοι.α.[| ⋮ |]πολλάκις[|
| ~14 |]ναι. | ⋮ | |
| ~14 |]π.[| ⋮ |] |
| 30? | | ⋮ |]τιν |
| | | |] |
| | | | ... |

From Π⁷ fr. 1 + fr. 3 + fr. 17 + fr. 52 + three new fragments (=Π^{7*} 1); 26–30 (left side)
Π⁷ fr. 2 + a new fragment (=Π^{7*} 2); 28–31 (right side) Π⁷ fr. 4.

2]Α,]Κ? ιο-|πλό]κοισιν Sn, the rest Lobel 3 M] Sn Ἀρτέμιδ[GH (cf. Δ in line 15): ἀρτεμία[(=‘health’: cf. Plato, *Crat.* 406 D) Lobel Ω[; Λα]τῶϊον Ἀσ[τερία Lobel 4 λ[έ]χος GH; μεί-|λ[ι]χος Lobel (for reasons of space) ἀμφέποι[ισ’ Lobel: ἀμφεπό[λει GH ἄν]θεα Lobel ΔΙΑ: τοια[ύτας GH 5]Υ GH, Sn: Υ Lobel [χεται or [χονται Lobel: [χομαι, [χομεθα? 6 (left) GH: Lobel thought there was too little space αι Lobel: θυσι[ας ἔκατι? 11 suppl. Lobel 14 ὠδίνας Π⁸ ὅπω[ς Maas ap. Schroeder (1923) 16 ῥόθ[o]ν is very unclear 17 τελέσαι Sn (e.g. ὀλ[βον θέλουσαι]; τελε[ί]αι or τελέαι GH; τελε[τ]αί Lobel δ’ ὀλ[ο]υγαί Deubner (1941) 19 ἄν], ἐπ] Hunt 20 ᾄς GH: ᾄς (=ἔως) Wil 21]X,]Α,]Α χαρὰν τότ’ ἄρ’ ἀκταίνοντο suggested by Lobel (see n. 24) 23 EC or E[.] Π^{9c}: AC Π^{9c}

... with the nine Muses. ... Guarding the bed where Leto gave birth to Artemis, Asteria (?), you pluck the flowers of such poetry. And there often comes from Naxos ... for the sacrifice of sleekly reared sheep in the company of the Graces to the Cynthian cliff, where they say that black-clouded, bright-thundering Zeus sat above the heights and guarded with providence, when the mild-minded daughter of Coeus was released from her sweet birth-pang. When the twins shone like the sun, moving towards the bright light, Eleithuia and Lachesis emitted a great noise from their mouths ... seized ... the native (women? nymphs?) spoke ... glorious ... fled man ... without ... often ...

The Apollonian theme of the song is a strong reason for supposing that it might have been from a παιάν, and *Paianes* may have been one of the genres included in Π⁷.¹ Delos is the most likely place of performance, and the word Να]ξόθεν in line 6 suggests that it may have been composed for performance by Naxians.

The first surviving lines relate to poetry. There was a reference to the nine Muses in line 2.² Lines 3–5 seem to contain an invocation

¹ See pp. 163–4. If the interpretation of Π⁷ offered by D’Alessio (1997) is right, G1 and G2 will be from *Prosodia*.

² The Muses are nine according to Hes. *The.* 60, 74 (the number is not otherwise

to a goddess, perhaps Asteria, who is said to pluck flowers of poetry as she attends the bed of Leto.³ The end of line 5 probably describes the arrival of a Naxian *θεωρία* and in lines 6–7 *λιπαροτρόφων θυσί[α | μήλων]* could well denote the purpose of its visit—a sacrifice on Delos.⁴ The arrival of the *θεωρία* is accompanied by the Kharites; we can compare their presence in the prayer that the *χορός* make at the start of D6.⁵

The destination of the *χορός*—*Κύ[νθιον παρὰ κρημνόν]* (line 8)—provides the transition to the story of the birth of Apollo.⁶ Zeus' supervision of the birth from Mount Cynthus is similar to the way in which he surveys the battle from Mount Ida in the *Iliad*, and the epithets *κελαινεφέ'* *ἀργιβρένταν* have a strong Homeric resonance.⁷ The providence of Zeus (*π[ρ]ονοί[α]*) is a detail unparalleled in Pindar and rare in early Greek poetry generally.⁸ The word *λέγο[ντι]* in line 9 suggests that Zeus' presence during the birth was part of an established version of the myth,⁹ but perhaps it has a merely rhetorical function, giving expression to a degree of reserve which is only appropriate when the poet pretends to be talking about unspecified in Pindar). A similar epithet *ἰσπλοκος* is applied to them at *Isth.* 7. 23; *Bacch.* 3. 71; *ἰσπλόκαμος* at *Pyth.* 1. 1; *PMG* 1001.

³ Flowers of the *παιάν* also at *Bacch.* 16. 8–9; fr. 4. 63; perhaps at *Pind.* D10. *ὑμνήσιος* is otherwise attested only in late sources (e.g. *Diod.* 4. 7); but note the morphologically analogous *χορεύσιος* in D6. 9, again virtually a hapax.

⁴ Naxos was fertile: see R. Herbst, *RE* s.v. *Naxos*, xxxii. 2092–3; *Pyth.* 9. 88–9. Zeus had the title 'Melosios' on Naxos: *IG* xii/5. 48.

⁵ The reference to the Kharites in D7. 10 may also accompany arrival; note also D5. 5; *Isth.* 5. 21.

⁶ Compare *Κυνθίω* at G4 col. 2. 14. Mount Cynthus is a regular feature of descriptions of the birth of Apollo: see *HH Ap.* 17, 26, 141; *Eur. IT* 1098 ff. Laager (1957), 60, says that this line implies that the birth took place on Mount Cynthus (as in *HH Ap.* 17–18 and 26, where Leto leans thereon); but surely if Zeus is watching the birth from Mount Cynthus, it could take place elsewhere.

⁷ e.g. *Hom. Il.* 11. 182–3; 8. 51–2. For *κελαινεφέ'* compare the description of Zeus at D6. 55; *ἀργιβρένταν* is a hapax. The striking collocation of the two adjectives is reminiscent of *Hom. Il.* 22. 178 *ἀργικέραυνε, κελαινεφές* ('with flashing thunder and black clouds'); Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus*, 32–3 (*CA* 228). For the final element of *ἀργιβρένταν* cf. *ἀναξιβρέντας* at *Bacch.* 17. 66; otherwise the MSS attest *-βρόντας* (*ἐλασίβροντα* in fr. 144, *καρτερόβροντα* in fr. 155, *αἰολοβρόντα* at *Ol.* 9. 43).

⁸ Divine providence in general is mentioned at *Aesch. Ag.* 683; *Soph. Tra.* 823; *Eur. Pho.* 636 (which Fraenkel (1950), ii. 330, takes to be modelled on *Ag.* 683); *Her.* 3. 108. The same word is used for reverence for the gods, e.g. at *Soph. OC* 1180. See Martin (1982), 13 ff.

⁹ At *Ol.* 9. 49 *λέγοντι μὲν* ('They indeed say') introduces the story of the flood and at *Ol.* 7. 54 *φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιὰ | ῥήσεις* ('The ancient utterances of men say') introduces the story of the early history of Rhodes. On such expressions see Richardson (1985), 395; Newman (1967), 46.

cient and unverifiable events, in which case it is conceivable that Pindar invented the scene. Either way, there may be a connection with the worship of Zeus and Athena on Mount Cynthus, of which there is indirect evidence for this period.¹⁰ In the context of the birth of Apollo, the word $\pi[\rho]ονοί[\alpha]$ suggests Athena Pronoia, who in one version of the myth guided the pregnant Leto to Delos; there is a possibility that Pindar was thinking of this.¹¹ Contrast the version in the Delian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: Zeus is mentioned only in the proem (lines 5 and 10), where he and Leto receive Apollo on Olympus. He makes no attempt to make it easier for Leto to give birth, and does not intervene to prevent Hera persecuting her.¹²

The description of the birth is attached by means of a temporal clause in lines 12 ff. Leto is described as $\alpha\gammaανόφρων$ (an echo perhaps of $\alpha\gammaανώτατον$ used of her at Hes.*The.* 408), and as $Κοίου θυγάτηρ$ (contrast C2. 44, where the same expression refers to Asteria). At the moment of birth she is relieved of the pain, which is paradoxically described as pleasant. The deities flash forth into the light of the sun, a common detail in descriptions of birth.¹³ What is unusual is that at the moment of birth they are compared to the sun. So Apollo shines like a star at line 441 of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and the epithet $\Phiοῖβος$ was probably interpreted as 'shining' in the fifth century BC; and in fact there are some indications that Apollo was already identified with Helios at this time, as Artemis

¹⁰ Bruneau (1970), 222 ff., presents evidence for the worship of Zeus and Athena on Mount Cynthus in the so-called Kunthion, established at the start of Delian independence (314 BC). That Athena was worshipped there from early times is proved by the archaic inscription from the Delion on Paros, *IG* xii/5. 210 (3) Ἀθηναίῃ Κυνθήῃ . See Bruneau (1970), 232; Verbruggen (1981), 200 ff.; Rubensohn (1962), 43 ff. We have no direct evidence that Zeus was worshipped there in the classical period, but it is a likely inference from the fact that Zeus and Athena were joint occupiers of the Kunthion during the period of independence.

¹¹ According to the *Deliacus* of Hyperides (Blass (1917), 124 ff.; *Suda* s.v. Πρόνοια , iv. 216. 6 Adler; *EN* 699. 56 s.v. Προναία Ἀθηνᾶ). See B2 n. 33. Aelius Aristides attributes a prominent role to Athena in his *Hymn to Athena* (*Or.* 37. 18), and he cites a παῖδιν for this information: see §5 n. 34. No evidence for worship of Athena Πρόνοια on Delos survives except Macr. *Sat.* 1. 17. 55 (dubious); Bruneau (1970), 249. Still, in selecting the word $\pi[\rho]ονοί[\alpha]$ at line 11 Pindar may have been influenced by the role of Athena Pronoia in Delian myth; thus, supplement $\text{Ἰ[\rho]ονοί[\alpha] σὺν Ἀθάνα}$ ('with Athena Pronoia')?

¹² Zeus' role is minimal also in Call. *Hymn to Delos*, where he does no more than calm Hera's anger (line 259; see Mineur on this line and on line 195).

¹³ Cf. *HH Ap.* 119; *Ol.* 6. 43; *Nem.* 1. 36.

was with the moon. The birth is presented as a sort of original epiphany.¹⁴

Pindar consistently makes Apollo and Artemis twins, but elsewhere this detail is rare.¹⁵ In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* Apollo is born on Delos and Artemis in Ortygia, wherever that was,¹⁶ and it is not stated that they were twins. There were many other traditions, some of them no doubt going back to the fifth century BC, that placed the birth of one or other deity in other localities.¹⁷ According to another version, they were both born on Delos but Artemis was born a day before, so that she was in a position to play midwife in the delivery of Apollo.¹⁸ It has been suggested that the version in which both deities were born on Delos became the dominant one during the period when Athens controlled Delos and was propagated by the Athenians, but the data do not allow us to establish this with certainty.¹⁹

Eleithuia²⁰ and Lachesis are present and send forth a repeated roar (ῥόθ[ο]ν) from their mouths;²¹ after that, perfect cries of celebration (δλ[ολυγαί line 17) were perhaps said to seize the island;²² then the ἐγχώραιο—native women or local nymphs—cried out. There were thus three shouts, like the three noises at the end of Bacch. 17. 128–9, a description of the joyful greeting that Theseus received when he returned to his ship after visiting the bottom of the ocean.²³ After this point the sense is unclear.²⁴

¹⁴ Apollo and Helios: p. 198; Artemis and the moon: Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 170 (*Xanthiai*); Eur. *IT* 21; Call. *Hy.* 4. 204. For births as epiphanies see Rainer (1975), 218.

¹⁵ Pindar: *Ol.* 3. 35; *Nem.* 9. 4. Elsewhere: e.g. ΣEur. *Hec.* 458; *GDRK* 51. 4–5.

¹⁶ For ancient suggestions about the identity of Ortygia see Allen, Halliday, and Sikes ad loc.; Laager (1957), 68 ff. I suspect that line 16 of the *Homeric Hymn* is supposed to allow an element of slack for competing versions of the myth.

¹⁷ Laager (1957), 79 with n. 1.

¹⁸ Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. 4. 1; Servius on Virg. *Ecl.* 4. 10 (iii/1. 46. 2 Thilo–Hagen); *Aen.* 3. 73 (i. 351. 18 Thilo–Hagen); Roscher (1884–1937), i. 577–8. Artemis was born on 6 Thargelion (D.L. 2. 44), Apollo on the 7th (D.L. 3. 3).

¹⁹ See Wernicke (1895), 21–2.

²⁰ The Pindaric form of the name, also at Call. *Hy.* 4. 257. The Homeric form is *Εἰλειθυία*. A third form *Εἰλήθυια* is found at Call. *Hy.* 4. 132; see Mineur ad loc.; Schmitt (1970), 28 ff.

²¹ For the association between the root ῥοθ- and *παῖνες* see §18 n. 9.

²² Deubner (1941), 14, comparing *HH Ap.* 119.

²³ The three sounds are the *δολυγή* of the *κούραι* (Nereids or Athenian maidens: see Gerber (1982)), the roar of the sea, and the *παῖν*-singing of the young men.

²⁴ In line 21 Lobel suggested *ἡχρὰν τότ' ἀρ' ἀκταίνοντο*, comparing *ὑποακταίνοντο* (sic), glossed *ἐτρεμον* in Hesych. iv. 211 Schmidt, which may be a variant on *ὑπερικταί-*

In lines 92 ff. of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* a number of goddesses were already present when the time came for the birth—Dione, Rhea, Themis, Amphitrite, and others—but Hera had made Eleithuia stay away through jealousy of Leto. Eleithuia eventually came after the goddesses sent Iris to fetch her, promising her a necklace nine cubits long. In Pindar's version the only goddesses present are Eleithuia and Lachesis, and he also includes native women or local nymphs, who answer their cries. Eleithuia and Fate preside over birth elsewhere in Pindar also, so that it could be argued that this is merely a conventional feature of the description of a birth. But it is also possible that the point of having Eleithuia present is to imply that she did not have to be summoned and that Hera did not have a vendetta against Leto.²⁵

A related point can be made in respect of Leto's suffering during the birth. According to the *Homeric Hymn* Leto was pierced by hopeless birth-pangs for nine days and nights (lines 91–2). Pindar mentions a birth-pang but describes it as *τερπνᾶς* (a sort of oxy-moron; cf. *ὠδίνος τ' ἐπατᾶς* at *Ol.* 6. 43), which presumably refers to the pleasant result of the birth but still has the effect of playing down Leto's suffering. Perhaps Pindar felt that if the birth of Apollo was part of Zeus' plan, bringing it about should not have involved Leto in excessive pain.

Here, then, are three respects in which Pindar's account of the birth differs from that presented in the *Hymn*, and we can add these to the differences between the second section of C2 and the *Hymn* already mentioned. It adds up to a corroboration of the hypothesis that lines 11 ff. of C2 announced a rejection of the *Hymn*. We can now see that one of the main points at issue is likely to have been the degree of involvement attributed to Zeus. Zeus is almost wholly absent from the *Hymn*, but Pindar has him supervising the birth in G1 and planning for it by preparing a place for the delivery in C2. His desire to emphasize the providence of Zeus may also explain

νοῦτο (Hom. *Od.* 23. 3). Lobel notes that the lexica qualify the latter word with *διὰ τὴν χαράν* (Lehrs (1865), 311–12), suggesting the possibility of *χαράν* in line 21.

²⁵ At *Nem.* 7. 1; *Ol.* 6. 41 ff.; also Isyllus' *παίδαν*, 52 ff. *CA* 134. Another reason for retaining Eleithuia may be that she had a place in Delian cult: thus, Olen was supposed to have composed a hymn to her: Paus. 8. 21. 3; 9. 27. 2; Call. *Hy.* 4. 257. The second group of Hyperborean maidens brought tribute to Eleithuia: Her. 4. 33. 5. A statue of Eleithuia from Delos at Athens: Paus. 1. 18. 5; Pingiatoglou (1981), 33. There was an Eleithuiaion in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos, at least during the period of independence: Pingiatoglou (1981), 33–6.

why Pindar seems to have omitted elements of the traditional story that involve suffering for Leto.

We can glean a little more about the role of Zeus in the story if we now turn to Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus*, two fragments of which have Delos for their subject (fr. 33c, 33d):

- 33c χαῖρ' ὦ θεοδμάτα, λιπαροπλοκάμου
 παῖδεσσι Λατοῦς ἱμεροέστατον ἔρνος
 πόντου θύγατερ, χθονὸς εὐρεί-
 ας ἀκίνητον τέρας, ἄν τε βροτοὶ
 5 Δᾶλον κικλήσκουσιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
 τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον.
 * * *
- 33d ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε φορητὰ
 κυμάτεσσιν παντοδαπῶν ἀνέμων
 ῥιπαῖσιν· ἀλλ' ἂ Κοιογενῆς ὁπότ' ὤδι-
 νεσσι θυλοῖσ' ἀγχιτόκοις ἐπέβα
 5 νιν, δὴ τότε τέσσαρες ὄρθαι
 πρέμνων ἀπώρουσαν χθονίων,
 ἄν δ' ἐπικράνοις σκέθον
 πέτραι ἀδαμαντοπέδιλοι
 κίονες, ἐνθα τεκοῖ-
 10 σ' εὐδαίμον' ἐπόφατο γένναν.

(Hail, island built by gods [*or* wedded to a god?], most lovely scion for the children of shining-haired Leto, O daughter of the sea, unmoved marvel of the broad earth, called Delos by mortal men, but by the blessed ones of Olympus known as the far-shining star of the dark-blue earth . . . For before, she was tossed on the waves by the blasts of all sorts of winds. But when the daughter of Coeus, raging with the agony of imminent childbirth, set foot on her, then it was that the four straight pillars with adamantine bases rose from the roots of the earth, and on their capitals held up the rock. There it was that she gave birth to, and beheld, her blessed offspring.)

The two fragments seem to have been separated by about eight lines.²⁶ One clue about their position within the *Hymn to Zeus* is provided by the fact that fr. 33c begins with an address to a place. These seem to occur only at the start of songs,²⁷ but the start of the *Hymn to Zeus* is known to be another fragment (fr. 29). Another possibility is that these fragments represent the start of a song within the *Hymn*. In that case, who sings it? Snell proposed the

²⁶ The stanza of which fr. 33c is the beginning went on for at least a further 6 lines, and two lines are lost from the start of fr. 33d.

²⁷ Meyer (1933), 56 ff.; Radt (1958), 103.

Muses, who appeared at some point in the *Hymn*,²⁸ and suggested that they might have sung several songs, these fragments representing the start of one of them. Since the *Hymn* seems to have contained a catalogue of Zeus' wives,²⁹ there is a chance that the Muses sang one song for each wife, in which case fr. 33c and 33d will have come from the one about Zeus' relationship with Leto.

What these fragments say or imply about the birth of Apollo has much in common with C2: the etymological allusion in fr. 33c. 6 (*τηλέφαντον* because 'Delos' means 'clear'; *ἄστρον* suggesting 'Asteria'); the floating island in fr. 33d. 1 ff.; the rooting down of the island at fr. 33d. 5 ff. (which must have been touched on in C2. 53 ff.). However, there seems to be no reference to the story of Asteria (besides the etymological allusion in *ἄστρον*), nor any mention of the supervisory role that Zeus plays in G1, nor is the rooting down of the island attributed to Zeus, as it probably was in C2.

In fact, it is quite likely that all these were included. The episode of the pursuit of Asteria would fit nicely into the eight or more lines that are lost between the two fragments and could have developed smoothly from the word *ἄστρον* in 33c. 6. The rooting down of the island could have been attributed to Zeus either in the lines between the fragments (e.g. '[Zeus rooted Delos down,] for before it was tossed on the waves') or in the lines immediately following fr. 33d (e.g. by way of an apostrophe: 'All this, Zeus, was your doing'), while the proper place for an account of Zeus' supervision of the birth would perhaps be later on, during the description of the birth which seems to have followed fr. 33d. But the main reason for supposing that Zeus was given a role here is that, since the song from which the fragments come was part of the *Hymn to Zeus*, we would expect that, whoever it is sung by, it must have had the praise of Zeus as its direct or indirect aim and so would have stressed elements in the story that reflect Zeus' providence—such as how he rooted down the island (as in C2. 50 ff.) and how he watched over the birth (as in G1. 11).

The fact that Pindar included an extensive account of the origin of Delos in the *Hymn to Zeus* seems to corroborate the thesis argued for earlier, that C2. 11–12 implies a relation to the *Homeric Hymn* which included elements of imitation and elements of modification. For we now have reason to believe that Pindar thought not just that

²⁸ See fr. 31 (p. 11 in SnMae); Snell (1953), 88.

²⁹ See fr. 30; Snell (1953), 75 ff.

Zeus planned and supervised the birth (as we can see from G 1. 11 and C 2. 50 ff.) but that Zeus' role in this was a crucial illustration of his providence. The more importance Pindar attached to the episode in this respect, the more likely it is that he would have wanted to distance himself from the version of the birth of Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn*, in which the providence of Zeus plays no part.

G2 (*Pa.* XII (a))

] . σοφ[
] ε . . . νιαν π[
] ἀγε προφα[
 Α]ατοιῖδαι[. . .] ν.
 5 .] ε ξ ι α [. . .] . [. . .]
 .] δ α π [. . .] λ ω ν . [
 .] μ ο σ ω π ο λ υ σ έ π τ [
 — (?) .] ε ι ν ο τ ο ι τ έ κ ε π α λ [
 .] π ρ ο σ ο δ ο ν τ [
 10 . .] . ε χ ο ρ ό ν ύ π ε ρ τ α τ [
 . . .] χ ά ρ ι ν λ [. . .] τ ε κ [
 . . π] έ μ π ρ ε ι μ . λ ο ι κ α [
] . ν τ α ς ο ι γ ε ι ν [

Π⁷ fr. 37+43+44 combined by Lobel (1961), 16 (=fr. 11) with five additional fragments (=Π⁷ 11); ends of 4 ff. may be contributed by Π⁷ fr. 74

2]E, and perhaps ΠΑΝΙΑΝ or ΤΑΝΙΑΝ (the first letter has a prominent vertical stroke) 3 But for the accent]Α, χορ]αγέ would be attractive 4 ἴ 5 δ]εξία
 Sn 6 Απ[όλ]λων may be too short N·[, Π·[, or ΓΟ[7 δ]μόσω, ε]μός ὦ?
 Sn 8 probably a παράγραφος K]? Sn 9 ἀ]πρόσοδον or εὐ]πρόσοδον?

. . . For the children of Leto . . . much-revered . . . bore . . . approach . . .
 χορός highest . . . grace . . . sends . . . to open

In line 3 there seems to be a reference to prophecy; in line 4 to the children of Leto; in line 8 to a birth, perhaps that of Apollo and Artemis; in line 9]πρόσοδον suggests a procession. χορόν . . . π]έμπει

in lines 10–12 also suggests self-description.¹ Taking these points together, there is a good chance that G2 is from either a Paian or a Prosodion.

G3 (Pa. XVI)

~4]ονδ' ἐφ[
 ~4]ν ἄναξ Ἀπολλον
 ~4]α μὲν γὰρ εὐχομαι
 ~5]θέλοντι δόμεν
 5 ~4]ι δύναμις ἀρκεῖ·
 κατεκρίθης δὲ θνα-
 τοῖς ἀγανώτατος ἔμμεν
 ~8]μα[.]νατ[.]οιναρ

Π²⁸ fr. 3; lines 6–7 cited in Plut. *De E ap. Delphos*, 394 B.

1 Δ' Sn (1962) suggested κλυθι, εἰ καὶ πρότερον λαὸν τόνδ' ἐφίλεις or ἐφύλαξας 3 ὕ
 4 θυμῷ Sn Ἐ 5 ὦν σοι Sn 6 κατεκρίθη Plutarch (Apollo is the subject)
 7 Ω Ἐ 8]μά[ρ]νατ[Lobel]·

. . . lord Apollo . . . I pray . . . willing (mind) to give . . . power is sufficient . . . you were judged to be most gentle to mortals . . .

Clearly from a prayer to Apollo. The worshipper seems to sanction his prayer by implying that he is willing to give whatever he can (this seems more likely than to take θέλοντι as describing Apollo's attitude). The most interesting feature is the one that Plutarch cites the passage for, namely the idea that Apollo is judged ἀγανώτατος. For the simple adjective see on G1. 12. If]μά[ρ]νατ[ο is the correct supplement in line 8, there is an interesting juxtaposition of the two sides of Apollo's nature.¹

I put this fragment in Group G because Π²⁸ contains only three fragments, of which the other two belong to Pindar's *Paianes*: C2

¹ In line 13 οἶγεν in this context suggests opening the gates of spring, as at fr. 75. 14–15 φοινικοεάνων ὅπουτ' οἰχθέντος Ὠρᾶν θαλάμου ('When, after the chamber of red-clothed Horai has been opened'), or the harbour of salvation, as in Philod. παίων, 36 ᾤξ[as δ' ὄρ]μον [ἄμοχθον].

¹ For Apollo's double nature see pp. 121–3.

and Bz; there is thus a good chance that the third does also, and the content of the fragment does nothing to diminish this probability.

G4 (fr. 60 (b))

| col. 1 | col. 2 |
|----------------|--------|
|]ν[| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
| 5]ύπ. . [] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
| 10] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
| 15] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
|] [| |
| | |

what Mount Cynthus was for Zeus during the birth of Apollo (cf. G1. 11).²

G5 (*Pa.* VII (a))

μυγεῖσ' α[
 παιδα· τ[
 ὁ μέγιστος
 εὐαλάκ[ατον
 5 ἰσόθε[ον ε-
 λαχύν[ωτον
 νᾶσον[
 ζέμεν[

Π³ fr. VII¹; fr. VII¹ has]ρον at what would be line 48; fr. VII¹ and VII¹ may be from soon after the page that contained the start of D7

1 ΓÊIC' 3 'OMÊΓ 4 ἈΛᾶ 5 CÔΘ 6 XŶN[7 οἴκι-, κτι- Rutherford
 . . . having intercourse . . . child . . . the greatest [god] . . . with a good
 distaff . . . equal to the gods . . . island with a slim back . . .

Lines 1–2 seem to refer to the conception and birth of a child, who is perhaps said to be equal to the gods (line 5). ὁ μέγιστος could well be Zeus (cf. *Ol.* 10. 45); εὐαλάκ[ατ- in line 4 presumably refers to a goddess.¹ Then there is a reference to something with a short back, perhaps an island (lines 5–7).² This would suit Delos, and the fragment might come from an account of the birth of Apollo. However, the adjective ἰσόθε[ον could refer to the offspring, and in that case it would have to be a hero rather than a god (perhaps Aiakos on Aegina?).

commission for the patron of Simonides and his only known Thessalian commission is *Pyth.* X¹; for Simonides and Scopas see *PMG* 542 = Plato, *Prot.* 339 A–346 D.

² See Aesch. *Su.* 786; *Ag.* 289, 309; Arat. 833; *SH* 944. 11; *TrGF* ii fr. 639. 24; Xen. *Cyr.* 3. 2. 11; 6. 3. 6; 6. 3. 13; 6. 4. 12; *Hipp.* 4. 10.

¹ χρυσήλακος is a common epithet of goddesses, used of Melia in fr. 29. 1. εὐαλάκτος is paralleled only by Theocr. 18. 22, in which the sense is comic since the poem is about the presentation of an ἡλακάτη. ² See p. 286 on D4. 14.

G6 (*Pa.* VIIIb (a) 1-4)

].ε.[].[
].είσο.[
].τοιτοτε.[
 παι]ἀνά τ' ἐπορσα.[

 Π⁴⁵ fr. 1

2]P 3]E or]· 4]ἈΝΑ suppl. Lobel

... raise the paean ...

Apropos of line 4, editors note that ἐπόρνυμι occurs only here in Pindar, though the simple ὀρνυμι and ἀνόρνυμι are used by him elsewhere of song. The unique occurrence of the word is explained nicely if we bear in mind that verbs with the prefix ἐπι- are used frequently in the context of the παῖάν-cry, with the implication that it is uttered as a sort of additional endorsement or encouragement.¹

G7 (*Pa.* VIIIb (a) 5 ff.)

]παῖαν εἰς,[~?]]τε προοιμ[
].τον Ὀλυμπ[
 Ἀ]πόλλωνι
]' . . ταλίανδ[
 5].οντίμο.[
] . . []ωγαρχ.[
].ιβατανα[
].ο.[]τονδ[
]ε.[. .]νμε[
 10] . . . [

 Π⁴⁵ fr. 1

¹ See p. 71.

TITLE Lobel ap. Maehler in *POxy* 56; the title is within the main column of text in Π, and there is no line to separate it from the following text 4 *Ka]σταλίαν?*
 Lobel;]ἐντα λίαν Mae (cf. B5) 7 TÂN: ἐ]πιβάταν Mae

Identification of the title (written in the text in the papyrus) is suggested not only by the preposition εἰς but also by the reference to a proem in the next line, although the inclusion of the genre-name marks it as different from other titles found in papyri of the *Paianes*.¹ The supplement *Ka]σταλίαν* in line 4 is attractive in view of the genre, but against it is a trace of a breathing or accent just to the left. There may be an overlap with] .ταλίαν .[in B5, where *Ka]σταλίαν* is definitely ruled out.²

G8 (fr. 140a)

| | | |
|---------------|-----|-------|
| |] | νον[|
| [|] . | νον[|
| | | ιδετ[|
| str. A [⌘ |] | επο[|
| Π]αρίοις [εἰς |] | ..[|
| Ἀπόλλωνα (?) | | |

(At least str. A. 2-20 and ant. A. 1-4 missing)

| | | |
|-----------|---|---------------|
| ant. A | | |
| fr. 1 a25 |] | ποι |
| |] | σιδε[. .] . |
| |] | γε[. .]ων |
| |] | ον |
| |] | φα |
| a30 |] | |
| |] | |
| |] | |
| |] | πα[. . . .] |
| |] | [. . .] |

¹ See pp. 151-2; Rutherford (1991b).

² Lobel and Maehler in *POxy* lvi ad loc. Against the identification is the colometry: G6-7 seems to contain the ends of lines, whereas B5 probably contained the beginning, to judge from the lines of scholia below the text, which start more or less in line with a point a couple of letters to the left of .ταλίαν.

| | | | |
|--------|-----------|---------------|----|
| a35 | |]μεπερλι | |
| | |]ωι πολλόν | |
| | ἄλσηι (?) | ἔσχη]ον τ' ἐν | |
| | |] | 12 |
| a39 | |]αν τρίχα | |
| [____] | |]ι | |
| ep. A | . | . | . |
| a45 | |]α | |
| | . | . | . |
| a48 | |]ι | |
| | . | . | . |

12

(Lacuna of at least 23 lines: a49–52 or 55 [epode], b1–19 [strophe])

str. B

b20 ____ φ[ι]λ[.]ν μι[--

| | | |
|--------|--|----|
| ant. B | τοὶ πρόιδ[ο]ν αἶσαν α[| |
| | ζοι τότ' ἀμφε.οντατ.[| |
| | Ἑρακλῆης· ἀλία [δ' ἐ]πι[| |
| | ναῖ μολόντα σ[.]ν[.]π[.]...σφεν | 3 |
| b25 | θο.οι φύγον ον[.....].[.]...
πάντων γάρ ὑπ[έ]ρβιος ανα.σ ἔφα[
ψυχὰν κενεώ[ν] ἔμ' ἐ[η]κ' ἐρύκεν...[
λαῶν ξενοδα[ί]κτα βασιλῆ-
ος ἀτασθαλία κοτέω[ν] θαμά, | 6 |
| b30 | ἀρχαγέτα τε [Δ]άλου
πίθετο παῦσέν [τ'] ἔργ' ἀναιδῆ...
γάρ σε λ[ι]γυσφαράγων κλυτὰν ἀν-
τά, Ἑκαβόλε, φορμίγγων,
μνάσθηθ' ὅτι τοι ζαθέας | 9 |
| b35 | Πάρου ἐν γυάλοις ἔσσατο ἄ[ν]ακτι
βωμόν πατρί τε Κρονίῳ τιμάεν-
τι πέραν ἰσθμὸν διαβαίς,
ὅτε Λαομέδον- | 12 |
| b39 | τι πεπρωμένοι' ἤρχετο
____ μόροιο κάρυξ. | |
| ep. B | ἦν γάρ τι παλαίφατον [...]ον | |

ἵκε συγγόνους
 τρεῖς π[...].εω[...].ν κεφαλὰν .ρ. .ται[
 ἐπιδ[~10]αιμα[...].[...].[...].[

3

fr. 2 αλμα[
 τε μαχα [ἦ-
 ρώνων α[

b-5 λάχον κ[
 νον ἐγὼ [
 ὀργίοις α[
 αὐξάνει[
 — αἰολ[

5-10

Π¹¹ (regular capitals) consists of two fragments: fr. 1 contributes G8 up to b44; fr. 2 contributes G9 and the end of another song, which is generally assumed to be G8 although we cannot be sure that the columns were contiguous. If they were not, it is also uncertain that the two songs were grouped in the same genre. Π²⁶ fr. 97 contains G8. a36-9; Π²⁶ does not contribute to G9, but it is a reasonable assumption that G9 was in Π²⁶ if the two fragments were in close proximity in Π¹¹. Π²⁶ fr. 16 provides a possible title for G8. Irrelevant to G8-9 (fr. 140a, 140b) would seem to be fr. 140c (=PMG 998) and 140d. Because the length of the triad is uncertain, I number the two consecutive triads a1 ff. and b1 ff.

TITLE (in main column of text in Π) Lobel; alternatively *Kλ*αρίοις[. . . Rutherford a2]² a37 ἀλοη Σ]ONTEN Π¹¹;]NT'EN Π²⁶; ἐσχ]ον τ' suggested by Sn on basis of Σa36 b21 [O] Sn: [Ω] (GH) is too long b22 ΦΕ better than ΦΙ AT[GH: ΕΤΑ[Oates, Samuel, and Welles (1967) b23 or [δ' α]νὰ Sn b24 ΝΑΪ Π: ΜΑΪ Oates, Samuel, and Welles (1967)]Υ[: or]Φ[EN: or ΕΔΙ b26 Sn, Ferrari (1990): ἀν[τα]σε φα[νείς Diehl (1917) b27 Ferrari (1990): ἐπέ[ω]ν Sn perhaps ἐρυκε καί[ερ] Sn; Δοξ[ίας Ferrari (1990) b29 Π^{PC}: ΑΤΑΝΘ Π^{PC} b30 Π^{PC}: ΑΡΧΑΠΤΑΙ Π^{AC} b31 ἐρχ' ἀναιδῆ Sn, excluded by Oates, Samuel, and Welles (1967) at line end e.g. βοᾷ, τίεν Sn, ἵκεν, ἀμφήλυθεν Rutherford b36 GH: τιμίεαν|τι Π: τίμιε ἀντιπέραν Blass (1906) b39 πεπρωμένος Theiler (1941) b40 κάρυξ Slater (1969a): κάρυξ Sn b42 ΕΪΚΕ Π

Σ a36 (Π¹¹) μαντευμάτων (Π²⁶) ἐσχοντ[< 25] |]ῆ ἐσχον[< 25]
 a37 τὰ ἄλοη μετ[< 23] |]. λογος ἐν[< 24] | Δίδυμο(s) δ(ε)
 πρ(ός) τα[< 20] b-1]. α. ρις

a37 McNamee(1977): πρ(ότερον) SnMae b-1 D'Alessio:]μας GH

MARGINAL TITLE. *For the Parians* (?). . . (b21) They foresaw their fate . . . then . . . Heracles; . . . (someone) coming in a ship of the sea . . . they fled . . . superior to all in might . . . he said (?) . . . '(Apollo) sent me to suppress the spirit of the foolish people, often angry at the arrogance of the people's guest-killing king . . . ' And he obeyed the leader of Delos and stopped

shameless deeds . . . Since, Far-shooter, the sound of bright-sounding, famous lyres reaches (?) you, remember that he founded in the hollows of holy Paros an altar for the lord (Apollo) and the honoured Cronian father, striding over the neck of land, when he began the appointed doom for Laomedon, a herald of it. For it was something long proclaimed. He came to the three relatives. . . .head . . . (fr. 2) battle . . . of heroes . . . I . . . rites . . .

(a36) Oracles. (a37) The groves . . . Didymus to (?) . . .

I distinguish the following sections:

1. Heracles' attack on Paros. We know from other sources that Heracles came to Paros on his way to fetch the belt of Hippolyte (his ninth labour).¹ The island was at that time under Cretan control. In revenge for the deaths of two of his men he killed four sons of Minos (Eurymedon, Chryses, Nephalion, Philolaus), and took on board as hostages two grandsons of Minos (Alcaeus and Sthenelus, the sons of Androgeos). Lines b21 ff. seem to refer to the sons of Minos who foresaw their fate, and line b23 perhaps refers to the arrival of Heracles. Ferrari suggests that lines b27 ff. refer to instructions from Apollo to Heracles in direct speech, with line b24 as the speech-frame.² The *κενεῶ[ν]* . . . | *λαῶν* are the foolish people of Paros.³ We do not know the name of their king.⁴ Heracles put his faith in Apollo, the archegete of Delos—the title suggests colonization, and Pindar is perhaps suggesting that it is as an act of colonization that Heracles' attack on Paros should be seen.⁵ Aspects of this narrative are reminiscent of the myth of D4: an original island

¹ Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 5. 9; see Galinsky (1972), 33.

² Ferrari (1990), 231. Pindar uses the adjective *ὑπέρβιος* of Heracles at *Ol.* 10. 15, also at *Ol.* 10. 29, of Augeas.

³ There are no exact parallels for *κενός* in the sense of 'arrogant'; we find the sense 'vain', as at *Ol.* 3. 45 *κενὸς εἶην* ('I would be vain'); Ar. *Frogs*, 530. Werner (1967), 452 ff., suggests that *κενεῶ[ν]* might be used of men in the sense of 'exhausted'. Perhaps, as Snell suggests, the original reading was *κενεῶ[ν] ἐπέ[ων]*.

⁴ According to Diod. 5. 79. 2, Rhadamanthus gave Paros to his general Alcaeus. The striking epithet *ξενοδαίκτης* ('murdering strangers') was perhaps imitated by Euripides, who uses *ξενοδαίκτης* of Cynus (another opponent of Heracles) at *Her.* 391; also *ξενοδαίτης* ('devouring strangers') at *Cyc.* 658. *ἀτασθαλίς* occurs only here in Pindar; comparable is *ἀτάσθαλος* of Sciron at Bacch. 18. 24.

⁵ Pindar uses the word *ἀρχαγέτας* of Apollo at *Pyth.* 5. 60, Tlepolemus at *Ol.* 7. 78; Bacchylides of Croesus at 3. 24; we find it of Apollo on Delos (*ID* 1506. 10; Bruneau (1970), 426 ff.) and in Sicilian Naxos (Thuc. 6. 2); on Delos it was more commonly associated with the hero Anios (Bruneau (1970), 413 ff.); see in general Malkin (1987), 241 ff.; Casevitz (1985), 245 ff. Heracles himself was given the title *ἀρχαγέτας* in Sparta: Xen. *Hell.* 6. 3. 6; Luc. *Sump.* 16. Another myth involving Heracles with implications of colonization is that of the attack on the Meropes of

race is wiped out and replaced by a new race with the blessing of the gods. The difference is that in D4 the destruction is natural, whereas in G8 Heracles executes the will of the god.

2. The foundation of the Parian Delion: since the sound of *φόρμιγγες* reaches (verb supplied at the end of b31) Apollo, he is invited to remember that Heracles founded an altar for him and for Zeus, having crossed over the neck of land (*ισθμός*). The Parian cult of Apollo is one of a number said to have been established by Heracles.⁶ Here the reference might be to two separate cult sites, but since the deities worshipped at the Delion included Zeus Basileus, the reference is probably just to the Delion.⁷ The neck of land might be the promontory extending west of the island, at the base of which the Delion is situated; but it seems more likely that Pindar means the Isthmus of Corinth, which Heracles is pictured as passing over on his way from Thrace (the labour immediately preceding was that of the mares of Diomedes) via Thebes and on to Asia Minor.

3. The treachery of Laomedon. *ᾄτε* in line b38 seems to introduce a new stretch of narrative: the foundation of the Delion happened when Heracles went as a herald of the fate appointed for Laomedon. This must refer to the story that Heracles went to Troy, where he rescued Laomedon's daughter Hesione, but was cheated of his promised reward by Laomedon.⁸ Apollodorus puts this episode after the labour of the fetching of the belt of Omphale, which Pindar does not mention. One reason Pindar may have singled out the myth of Laomedon is that it shows Heracles in a good light, as a force for law against treachery (compare fr. 169a).

4. Lines b41 ff. (from the start of the epode) may return to the story of Heracles' attack on Paros, or they may continue the story of Laomedon's treachery. The former seems preferable in so far as local Parian myth seems to have been the focus of the song; however, in favour of the latter is the fact that *τι παλαίφατον* could be thought

Cos, mentioned in fr. 33a; *Nem.* 4. 26; *Isth.* 6. 31; *Hom. Il.* 15. 26; also in the anonymous *Meropis* (=SH 903a).

⁶ Rubensohn (1962), 45, draws attention to parallels in Phigeos (Paus. 8. 16. 5) and Didyma (Paus. 5. 13. 11).

⁷ See Rubensohn (1962), 44 ff.; the other possibility would be that Pindar means the cult of Hypatos (i.e. Zeus) on the adjoining hill to the south: see Rubensohn (1949), 1841, referring to *IG* xii/5. 183.

⁸ Ferrari (1990) suggests that *ἤρχετο* means 'went' rather than 'began' (like *διήρχετο* at *Ol.* 9. 93).

to expand the idea of Laomedon's appointed doom in the previous lines. In either case the identity of the *συγγόνους* | *τρεις* in lines b42–3 is unclear. It is unsafe to use fr. 140b in the reconstruction, because it may not belong with fr. 140a.

As far as can be seen, the song serves as an aetiology for the cult of Apollo in Paros—which must mean the one at the Parian Delion. An aetiology of the cults of Zeus Basileus and Heracles Kallinikos may have been provided as well.⁹ The song was probably performed at the Delion, and the chances are that the performers were Parians, though a passage of Aristophanes' *Wasps* (line 1184) suggests that Paros may have been visited by foreign *θεωρίαι*.¹⁰ The genre is unclear. We would expect a cult song in honour of Apollo to be a *παιάν*. If fr. 2 belongs with fr. 1, the song does not seem to have ended with a triad-final refrain.¹¹

G9 (fr. 140b)

| | |
|-------------|--|
| str. A | |
| στ[#] | Ἰων[|
| καὶ | ἀοιδ[ὰν κ]αὶ ἀρμονίαν |
| Ἀπό]λλ(ωνα) | αὐλ[οῖς ἐ]πεφράσ[ατο |
| | τῶ[ν γε Διο]κρῶν τις, οἷ τ' ἀργίλοφον, |
| 5 | π[ᾶρ Ζεφυρί]ου κολῶ[ναν, |
| | ν[αῖον ὑπέ]ρ Αὔσονία[ς ἀλός |
| | λι[παρὰ πόλ]ις ἀνθ[.] |
| | οἶον [ὄ]χημα λιγ[ὺ καὶ εὐπλε- |
| | κὲς Διο[κρ]ὸν παιήρ[|
| 10 | Ἀπόλλωνί τε καὶ [|
| | ἄρμενον. ἐγὼ μ[|
| | παῦρα μελ[ι]ζομέν[ου τέχναν |
| | [γλώ]σσαργον ἀμφέπω[ν ἔρε- |
| | θίζομαι πρὸς αὐ[.] |
| 15 | ἁλίου, δελφίνος ὑπ[ό]κρισιν, |

⁹ See Rubensohn (1949), 1849, referring to *IG* xii/5. 234.

¹⁰ Rubensohn (1962), 39 ff., in favour of Parians.

¹¹ On possible religious implications of fr. 2 see Lavecchia (1994), 87–8.

τὸν μὲν ἀκύμονος ἐν πόντου πελάγει
αὐλῶν ἐκίνησ' ἔρατὸν μέλος.

15

Π¹ col. 2. 9 ff. (see on G8); 4 ff. ΣPind. *Ol.* 10. 13 (Dr i. 314. 18 ff.); 15-17 Plut. *Sumpr. probl.* 704 F-705 A; *Soll. anim.* 984 B-C

TITLE Blass ap. GH, GH: Διὸς καὶ [Ἀπό]λλ(ωνος) (?) Rutherford; or Ἀπόλλωνος] καὶ [Ἀ]λλ(ο) ΣG8, b-1 could be the first line 1 e.g. Ἴων[ίδος ἀντίπαλον Μοῖσας Schr (1903) 3 Schr (1903) σατ' Ἰταλάν Ferrari (1990) 4 γε Garrod (1922) 6 ναῖον Turyn: νόουσι GH; ναῖονθ' Schr (1903) ἀλός Wil 7 λι[παρά πόλ]ις GH; λι[μνάς, ὄτ'] Ferrari (1990); ἰσάνεμ[ον Bornemann (1928) ἀνθ[ηκε GH; ἀνθ[ηκας Fileni (1987) 8 ff. GH: OION Π 8-9 [εὐπλε]κῆς Fileni (1987) 9 Λο[κρ]όν Ferrari (1990): ΚΕC'Ο[]ΟΝ or ΚΕC'ΑΟ[]ΟΠ Π; ὁ[μ]όν Sitzler (1911a); ὁ[λ]όν Diehl (1917); ο[λ]όν Bornemann (1928); λό[γ]ον Mae παιήσ[υ] Mae; παιήσ[υ]α GH, Ferrari (1990); παιήσαι πάσαι Rutherford 10 [Ἀρτέμ]ιδι Schr (1903); [Μοῖσαις or [Χαρίτεσσιν Diehl (1917) 11 μ[ᾶ]ν κλύων GH 12 τέχνας GH; θυμὸν? Rutherford (cf. *Nem.* 7. 10) 14 αὐτά Wil; ἀϋτᾶ[ν Lobel ap. SnMae; προσαυξ[άνων Mae; δοιδάν Plutarch

[MARGINAL TITLE?: . . . and to Apollo . . .] One of the Locrians who live by the white-topped hill of Zephyrion above the Ausonian sea, a shining city, devised song and harmony for αὐλοῖ [opposed to the Ionian Muse]. He [dedicated] a kind of [bright-sounding] well-built wagon, a Locrian one, (fitting it together with) paeans suited to Apollo [and Artemis]. I . . . following the swift-tongued art of him singing few things am provoked to shout in imitation of the sea dolphin, which in the ocean of the waveless sea the lovely melody of αὐλοῖ moved.

The Locrian in line 4 must be Xenocritus of Locri.¹ According to pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica*, Xenocritus was one of the poets involved in the reorganization of the Spartan Gumnopaidia in the early seventh century BC.² Pseudo-Plutarch also reports that there was a dispute over the genre of his songs: one view was that they were παιᾶνες, another that they were ἡρωϊκαὶ ὑποθέσεις πράγματα ἔχουσαι ('heroic themes containing actions'), and thus διθύραμβοι.³ These two opinions may reflect Pindar's view (see below), and a view of someone else (Glaukos of Rhegium?) in disagreement with Pindar. A scholion on *Olympian* 10 tells us that Xenocritus was the inventor of the Locrian ἀρμονία (Λοκριστὶ ἀρμονία).⁴ The preceding

¹ For the text see Fileni (1987); I am indebted to F. Ferrari's comments (by letter).

² Ps.-Plut. *Mus.* 1134 E.

³ Chs. 9 and 10: παιάν-singing was common in south Italy, to judge from Aristox. fr. 117W (see p. 38).

⁴ ΣPind. *Ol.* 10. 13 (Dr i. 315. 5-6).

lines clearly refer to Xenocritus also.⁵ The opening line has to do with an Ionian person or thing. Pindar is unlikely to be saying that Xenocritus wrote Ionian music; later musicological sources say that the Locrian mode was the same as the later Aeolian (still later the Hypodorian),⁶ and this is clearly distinguished from the Ionian mode (later the Hypophrygian).⁷ Pindar's point may have been that Xenocritus' music was different from and perhaps opposite to Ionian music, both geographically and typologically. For such specification by opposition, one can compare this description of an unknown poet from a fragment of Telestes' *Asklepios* (PMG 806):

ἡ Φρύγα καλλιπνόνων αὐλῶν ἱερῶν βασιλῆα,
 Λυδὸν ὃς ἄρμωσε πρῶτος
 Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούσας νόμον αἰολόμορπον
 πνεύματος εὐπτερον αὔραν ἀμφιπλέκων καλάμοις.

3 Hartung (1856), ii. 315: νομοαἰολονορφαῖ MS

(Or the Phrygian king of fair-blowing sacred αὐλοί who first fitted together the Lydian tune, shifting in form and opposite to the Dorian Muse, twining a well-winged breath of air with the reeds of the αὐλός.)

What the ethical associations of the Locrian and the Ionian modes were for Pindar is hard to establish. If the Locrian was appropriate for *παιᾶνες*, it was presumably stately and solemn; the Ionian is sometimes characterized as morally lax (e.g. by Plato), sometimes as austere (e.g. by Heraclides of Pontus), and the former interpretation would provide an ideal contrast with the hypothetically stately Locrian.⁸

Lines 7–11, in which the focus seems to have narrowed to Xenocritus' *παιάν*, are unfortunately difficult to interpret. What we have

⁵ Wilamowitz (1922), 501, thought that the proem of the song referred to two poets, an Ionian and Xenocritus (reading τῶν τε Λοκρῶν τις in line 4), but this seems excessively complex. Callimachus' use of the verb φράζεσθαι of Xenocritus in fr. 669 may allude to this passage.

⁶ Cleonides 198. 17 Jan; Heraclides of Pontus fr. 163 Wehrli (ap. Athen. 625 B); Abert (1899), 83.

⁷ For evidence see Pollux 4. 65; Cleonides, *Isag.* 198. 13 Jan; Baccheius 309. 9 Jan; Gaudentius 347. 10 Jan. Abert (1899), 95; West (1981); Nagy (1979), 96.

⁸ For the 'lax' Ionian mode see Plato, *Rep.* 398 E; for the 'austere' Ionian mode see Heraclides of Pontus, fr. 163 Wehrli (=Athen. 625 B). It has sometimes been supposed that the Ionian mode might have been used in laments, on the basis of Aesch. *Su.* 69 φιλόδουτος Ἰαονίοισι νόμοισι ('fond of lamenting in Ionian strains'), and ΣAesch. *Pers.* 938 αὐλεῖ Μαρνανδυνοῖς καλάμοις κρούων Ἰαστί ('he plays the αὐλός on Mariandynian reeds, in the Ionian ἄρμονία'), but this idea is disputed by Johansen and Whittle (1980), 65 ff., who argue for νομοῖσι ('meadows') at *Su.* 69.

is a comparison, in which a song by Xenocritus is compared to a chariot, as at C2. 13 and fr. 124(a). $\lambda\gamma[\nu(-?)]$ and $\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$ in lines 8–9 probably represent two adjectives describing the chariot, the second of which could well be $[\epsilon\upsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon-]\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$.⁹ The most direct interpretation of $\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ in line 8 is that it introduces the comparison, though it could also be exclamatory.¹⁰ The letters that GH read as $\omicron[\]\omicron\nu$ in line 9 look at first as if they might repeat $\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$, introducing a parallel clause, but then the accent and breathing are difficult to explain. In his most recent edition of the fragments Maehler has proposed that the sign that had been read as a smooth breathing is in fact a superscribed λ , restoring the word $\lambda\omicron[\gamma]\omicron\nu$. His hypothesis is presumably that the original scribe erroneously copied $\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ from the previous line, and a second scribe corrected by superscribing λ and γ (the latter lost in the lacuna). However, the incorrect accent over the second \omicron remains a problem. More recently, Ferrari has suggested that the acute accent might in fact be a superscribed ρ , and that another superscribed letter has been lost before this, so that the second scribe intended to restore $\Lambda\omicron[\kappa\rho]\omicron\nu$.¹¹ Ferrari's solution seems the best so far proposed. For the locution $\Lambda\omicron[\kappa\rho]\omicron\nu$ $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron[\nu\alpha]$ one can compare Archilochus' $\Lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\iota\omicron\nu$ $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron\nu\alpha$.¹² Xenocritus' composition is said to be appropriate ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ —picking up $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$ in line 2) to Apollo (and Artemis?), just as in *Thr.* III (fr. 128c). 1–2 $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ are described as $\tilde{\omega}[\rho]\iota\alpha\iota$ to Apollo and Artemis.¹³

There follows a passage of self-description by the singers (lines 11 ff.): when they hear a few notes of Xenocritus' music, they are provoked to sing,¹⁴ having a garrulous nature.¹⁵ The force of the

⁹ Suggested by Fileni (1987), 19. The word is particularly attractive because it is used of a chariot in Hom. *Il.* 23. 436 and at ps.-Hes. *Aspis*, 306, 370, and is used of poetry in D3. 12.

¹⁰ As at *Isth.* 6. 62 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ δ' $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ $\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\mu\omicron\iota\acute{\rho}\alpha\nu$ $\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\nu\omega\nu$ ('What a share of hymns they brought into the light!').

¹¹ Ferrari (1990), 234. In favour of this hypothesis is the unusually large number of corrections in Π^1 , as if the writer of the original was particularly careless.

¹² *IEG* 121. Maehler suggests that $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron[\nu-$ might represent a dative agreeing with Ἀπόλλωνι . But Pindar seems to reserve the longer form $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron\nu\omega\nu$ for the song; see Forssman (1966), 151. Furthermore, poets do not often use $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and Ἀπόλλων together; exceptions are Eur. *TrGF* 477 (*Likymnius*); Aristonoos, $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$, 4–5 (though this is part of a refrain); Erythraean $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ to Apollo, 18. Alternatives include $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron[\nu\iota\omicron\nu$, found e.g. at *AG* 16. 270, or $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron[\sigma\iota$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\iota\varsigma$, continuing the metaphor of the chariot (this would be easier if $\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ in line 8 introduced an exclamation).

¹³ Cited on p. 23. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$ suggests the rhetorical idea of $\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu$: see Taillardat (1986), 225 ff. We find this sense also at Lasus, *PMG* 702; Pratinas, *PMG* 712(b) (see Anderson (1966), 48); see also pp. 173, 383.

¹⁴ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon-|\theta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$: Borthwick (1967), 110 (cited by Slater (1969a)), gives Theocr.

detail *παῦρα* is unclear: it may be that it takes only a few notes of the music to inspire them, or it may be that Xenocritus composed little or used a *ἀρμονία* with few notes.¹⁶ They seem to say that they act in imitation of (*ὑπόκρισιν*)¹⁷ a dolphin which is inspired by αὐλός music at sea¹⁸ (the dolphin image is appropriate in the context of a *παιάν*, because Apollo is associated with dolphins).¹⁹

One possible scenario consistent with this would be that the *χορός* are from south Italy, perhaps from Locri itself, and see themselves as continuing the tradition established by Xenocritus. But they might have invoked the precedent of Xenocritus for purely formal reasons and not because they were from the same polis: compare other passages in which Pindar begins a song by referring to another poet: in *Olympian* 9 the short *καλλίνικος* of Archilochus that welcomed Epharmostus immediately after his victory is set against Pindar's more developed *ἐπινίκιον*, and in *Nemean* 2 the Homeric *ridai*'s practice of beginning with Zeus is not a model for the poet but a symbol for the fact that Timodemus has won his first victory at Nemea.²⁰

If the song began by talking about a *παιάν* by Xenocritus, this suggests that it may have been a *παιάν* itself. The paeanic appearance of G8 increases the chance (even if the two fragments are not from consecutive columns, they are probably from the same roll). However, this cannot be regarded as by any means certain. Against it is the title of G9, which may have included the specification that the song is dedicated to Apollo, whereas the titles of Pindar's *Paianes* seem to specify places. An additional factor is that (as Professor Ferrari points out to me) it would be pointless to specify that a *Paian*

5. 110–11 as a parallel: *τοὶ τέττιγες, ὀρῆτε τὸν αἰπόλον ὡς ἐρεθίζω; οὕτω κύμμες θην ἐρεθίζετε τῶς καλαμευτάς* ('Cicadas, do you see how I provoke the goatherd? So you provoke the reapers').

¹⁶ On *γλώσσαργον* see Fileni (1987), 48–9.

¹⁷ On the force of *παῦρα* see Fileni (1987), 20.

¹⁸ *ὑπόκρισιν* in line 15 is probably an accusative of respect governing *δελφίνος* as an objective genitive with the sense 'in imitation of' (see Page (1956)), though it might be the object of a verb at the end of the previous line, in which case the genitive might be subjective (i.e. the dolphin's imitation of the singer).

¹⁹ I would compare Eur. *Hel.* 1451–5; *El.* 435; ps.-Arion, *PMG* 939. 5; Achaëus, *TrGF* i. 20. 27 (*Moirai*); *Anacreonteia*, 57. 24 West; depictions of dolphin-riders on vases may reflect a lost comedy with a *χορός* of dolphin-riders: see Sifakis (1967), 36–8; (1971), 88–90.

²⁰ For example, it was in the form of a dolphin that Apollo led the Cretans to Delphi at *HH Ap.* 400; cf. the epithet 'Delphinios' (p. 61).

²¹ See Krischer (1965).

was dedicated to Apollo. Furthermore, the fact that G9 begins by talking about a *παιάν* by Xenocritus need not indicate that the song is itself a *παιάν*: *Nemean* 2 is not itself a *ῥυμος*, although it begins by talking about Homeridai; and although Bacchylides 16 begins by describing the *παιάν* which is sung at Delphi when Apollo returns, the song situates itself in the period before his return, and is meant to be a *διθύραμβος*.

A further clue to the genre of G9 may be the *χορός*' comparison of themselves to a dolphin responding to music, an image which makes a vivid contrast with the image of Xenocritus' *παιάν* as a static chariot.²¹ This comparison suggests that the *χορός* are dancing, which would suit the *ὑπόρχημα*, the primary sign of which seems to have been that it was accompanied by (or accompanied) dancing. We also know that hyporchematic dance was supposed to involve *μίμησις*, and there is an example of mimetic dance in a fragment of a *Hyporkhema* (Pindar fr. 107a; attribution uncertain) in which the singer issues an order to imitate in dance 'a Pelasgian horse or Amyclean bitch'. The hypothesis that G9 is from a *Hyporkhema* is made easier by the established link between the *ὑπόρχημα* and Apollo. However, even this line of argument is not secure, because the reference to dolphins might be motivated simply by the Apolline context, especially appropriate in so far as theoric performance at Apolline sanctuaries might require the singer to undertake a sea voyage. In the end, the genre of the song remains undeterminable on present evidence.²²

G10 (fr. 215 (a))

.].[...].[...].[...]
 ἄλλα, δ' ἄλλοισιν νύμμιμα, σφετέραν
 δ' αἰνεῖ δίκαν ἀνδρῶν ἔκλαστος.
 ἔασον, ὦ τάν, μή με κερτόμ[ει
 5 ἔστι μοι
 πατρίδ' ἀρχαίαν κτενὶ Πιερίδ[ων
 ὦ]στε χαίταν παρθένου ξανθ[αῦ(-)]?

²¹ The contrast between the two images is highlighted by Henderson (1992), 157 ff.

²² *ὑπόρχημα* and *μίμησις*: pp. 100–1. *ὑπόρχημα* and Apollo: §9 n. 26. Apollo Delphinios: p. 61.

of the performers, or their inexperience in performance (cf. D4. 21 ff.).³

This thought is capped by lines 5–7: in spite of the criticism anticipated, the singer, with the co-operation of the Muses, can praise his or her native land. The metaphor of praise ‘with the comb (κτεῖς) of the Muses as if it were the hair of a girl’ is remarkable. Perhaps Pindar is playing on the fact that κτεῖς can also mean the bridge of a λύρα, so that the κτεῖς Πιερίδων would be simultaneously the musical instrument, with which Pindar praises his patrons, and the Muses’ comb, which accomplishes the same task metaphorically.⁴

After this a παράγραφος probably marks a new stanza, which began with an invocation of Apollo; this may mark a transition to a new section of the song, perhaps a narrative or a conclusion. This section contained a description of music and festivity. At the point where the text breaks off, the singer may be saying that she or he follows (in song-dance performance) the example of Apollo or of intelligent people (συνετοῖς), i.e. poets.

The genre remains unclear. The reference to Apollo suggests the παιάν. The image of the hair of the παρθένος might be thought to be the sort of sentiment a παρθένος would be most comfortable with, which would suggest a παρθένειον. A fragment from a different papyrus, perhaps a ὑπόμνημα, suggests that in antiquity the comparison of the singer’s homeland to the hair of a παρθένος was regarded as dithyrambic in style, presumably:⁵ Πίνδ]αρός φη[σιν | πατρ]ίδ’ ἀρχαία[ν | χ]αίταν παρθέν[ου· το]ῦτο δὲ διθυρα[μβῶδες (‘Pindar calls “ancient home-land” “the hair of a virgin”; this is dithyrambic’). Needless to say, this testimony need not indicate that G10 was believed to be a διθύραμβος; the author is only interested in an isolated image, and διθυρα[μβῶδες here is probably a general term for a wild, lyrical style. There is, however, a mild paradox in the idea that a song classified as a παιάν was judged to contain dithyrambic features.

vity. Ferrari (1992c), 77, suggests that Herodotus (3. 38. 4), when he cites fr. 169a for a relativistic view of νόμος, was mistaken and meant to cite this passage.

³ I endorse ξαῖπον, suggested by Coles and Ferrari. As Ferrari (1992b), 231, points out, the expression ξαῖπον, ὦ τάν (‘Let alone, sir’) occurs also at Ar. *Frogs*, 952, 1243.

⁴ Ps.-Eratosthenes, *Catast.* 24 (MG iii/1. 30. 13 Olivieri); Hesych. s.v. κτένια, ii. 537 Latte.

⁵ Π¹⁷ 3–6.

G11 (fr. 215 (b))

~4] . α . . [
 ~4] παντ . . [
 ~4] . ας ἄλλοι . . [] δ . [
 ~4] . αν· ὁ δ' ἐπράυν[ε
 5 ~9] . σ . [.] τρα . [
 ~9]
 ~4] ναιγιν χθόν', ά[:: χ]άριν
 άμ]φέπων χρυ[σο]π[::]εξα Μοίσαις[
 νέ]μομαι παρὰ [κράνα ::]
 10 Παρ]νασσίδι [. .] . ο[:: άκρο]τόμοι[s]
 π[ε]τραίσι Κίρρα[::] . . ν πεδίων
 ~3] . ν εὐκάρη[::] . σ δ[μ]φαλόν· οὐθ' ἴπ[-
 ποισι]ν ἀγαλλόμ[ενος ::] . [
 ~4] . [.] ν[. .] μαν[. .] [::] . . ω . [
 15 ~10] . . [.] αν . [] ερο[::] . θε . . [
 ~15] . . [] . . [::]
 ~20] ν . α[::] σόμενο[
 ~20] . . δ[ο[::] κτεανω[
 ~20] . [::] . . τ . [

Π⁴ fr. 2(a) and (b), fr. 3(a) and (b); I have omitted fr. 2(c) and (d), two small fragments which SnMae suppose are from the second column. The reconstruction is tentative; Lobel (1961), 135–6, had serious doubts

3 perhaps Ψ[, e.g. ψ[ενδ? SnMae 4]Ο ἈΥ Ν[or Μ[suppl. Lobel 5]σι
 [σ]τρατ[Sn 7 μελά]ναιγιν or κνά]ναιγιν Lobel Ἀ ἄ[στεως Sn χ]άριν Lobel
 8 άμ]φέπων χρυ[σο]π[λόκοις Lobel εὐδ]οξα Sn Μοίσαις Lobel 9 suppl. Lobel
 [κράνα Sn (1962) 10 suppl. Lobel: ΙΔΙ Π^{bc}; ΙΟΙ Π^{ac}]ΑΟ[,]ΑΟ[,]ΧΟ[,]ΔΟ[?
 άκρο]τόμοι[s] Sn, but]ΙΟ Lobel 11 π[ε]τραίσι Sn: άρο]ύραισι Lobel (]Υ Lobel,
 but Snell compares Τ in κτενί at G 10. 6) Κίρρα[s εκ or Κίρρα]ίων Sn 12 ἐπει]σαν
 Sn δ[μ]φαλόν Lobel Ν·ΟΥΘ' 12–13 εὐκάρη[ου χθον]ός δ[μ]φαλόν· οὐθ' ἴπ[-
 ποισι]ν ἀγαλλόμ[ενος Sn

Σ 9 (in margin) εομαι

9 νέομαι Sn

(3) ... others ... (4) ... he soothed ... (7) ... earth with an aegis ... (8) ... tending gold ... Muses ... (9 ff.) I live by the fountain of Parnassus ... Sheer rocks of Cirrha ... plains ... with good harvest ... ὀμφαλός, not rejoicing in horses ... (19) possessions ...

In lines 9–11 someone seems to be saying that he lives in Delphi. If the fragments are correctly aligned, there was a reference to the Muses in line 8, and there may have been a statement about not exulting in horses in lines 13–14.

It has been suggested that this fragment may come from the same song as G10. SnMae present it as roughly compatible with the dactylo-epitrite metrical pattern of G11 (with the short line G10. 5 corresponding to G11. 6), and they reconstruct some lines accordingly. A corollary of this reconstruction is that ἄλλοι in G11. 3 would correspond to ἄλλοισιν in G10. 2, so that these might be two instances of a line repeated within the song, presumably part of a refrain, although the letter before ἄλλοι is different in each case (C in G11. 3, Δ in G10. 2). If right, this hypothesis would yield the interesting consequence that the speaker of G10 is a Delphian defending his homeland. However, the reconstruction is less than compelling, and I remain unconvinced that G10 and G11 are from the same song.¹

Given that they are likely to be from the same roll, (a) and (b) are probably from the same genre, even if they are not from the same song. There are indications that the fragments may be from *Paianes*: the reference to Apollo in G10. 8; the reference to Delphi in G11. 10 ff. The absence of any sign of a παιάν-refrain in the fragments might be thought to be a point against this, but it is not a fatal one. Lobel regarded G10. 4 as a problem for the hypothesis that the fragments came from *Paianes*,² but *Paianes* were generally performed by χοροί of singers visiting religious centres, and they will naturally have talked about their home countries. If their native land was not a particularly splendid place, it would be natural for them to anticipate criticism of it, and that may be what we find in G10. 4. One might compare D4. 13 ff., where a Ceian χορός ex-

¹ See SnMae ad loc. D'Alessio (1991), 114–15, endorses and expands, addressing the apparent incongruity between the start of G11. 7 and G10. 6.

² Lobel (1961), 131, says: 'If I am right in my interpretation of fr. 1. 4, it looks as though it must be discarded', referring apparently to 133: 'The connection of thought might, therefore, be: Do not, then, ridicule (me?) as—old fogey, boor, savage? ...'

presses a degree of self-consciousness about the humble status of their homeland, and anticipate criticism. The conversational tone of the anticipation here perhaps also finds a parallel in the first triad of D₄.

Group H
Manuscript Fragments and Testimonia
Perhaps from *Paianes*

H1 (fr. *54)

(a) τῆς γῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐν μέσῳ πῶς ἐστὶ τῆς συμπάσης, τῆς τε ἐντὸς Ἴσθμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκτός, ἐνομίσθη δὲ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τῆς γῆς ὀμφαλόν, προσπλάσαντες καὶ μῦθον ὃν φησι Πίνδαρος ὅτι συμπέσοιεν ἐνταῦθα οἱ αἰετοὶ οἱ ἀφεθέντες ὑπὸ Διός, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως, ὁ δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς· οἱ δὲ κόρακας φασί. 5
δείκνυνται δὲ καὶ ὀμφαλὸς τις ἐν τῷ ναῷ τεταινιωμένος καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ αἱ δύο εἰκόνες τοῦ μύθου. (Strabo 9. 3. 6)

[Delphi] is in the middle of the whole land of Greece, both inside and outside the Isthmus, and it was believed to be at the centre of the world, and they called it the navel of the earth, fabricating in addition the story that Pindar tells, that this was the meeting-point of the eagles sent by Zeus, the one from the west, the other from the east; some say they were crows. A certain navel is shown in the temple, covered in fillets, and on it are the two images from the story.

(b) τὸν δὲ ὑπὸ Δελφῶν καλούμενον Ὀμφαλὸν λίθου πεποιημένον λευκοῦ, τοῦτο εἶναι τὸν ἐν μέσῳ γῆς πάσης αὐτοῖ τε λέγουσιν οἱ Δελφοὶ καὶ ἐν ᾧδῇ τινι Πίνδαρος ὁμολογοῦντά σφισιν ἐποίησεν. (Pausanias 10. 16. 2)

What is called the Navel by the Delphians, made of white rock, is said by them to be in the middle of the whole earth, and in a poem Pindar wrote in agreement with this.

This myth could have been the subject of a whole song. Compare the role of doves in the foundation myth of Dodona and the cult of Zeus Ammon in Libya (F₂).

The idea that Delphi is the earth's navel is common in poetry; its primary reference is to the sacred stone which bore the name ὀμφαλός; but it can also denote the whole site, in so far as it was conceived as being at the centre of the earth.¹

¹ Pindar uses the word ὀμφαλός for Delphi quite often (e.g. D6. 17, 120).

In investigating the origins of the story, it is necessary to distinguish the religious significance of the stone itself (which seems to have Minoan antecedents) from the idea of the site as the centre of the earth. The latter looks like a very old notion: in the mythologies of many peoples the centre of the earth, often conceived of as a mountain, was regarded as a place of great sacred significance. For example, in Indian mythology the centre was Mount Meru, actually called 'the navel'; we find this also in West Semitic mythology. I draw attention also to a particular lexical parallel: Mount Garizim at the centre of Palestine was called 'navel of the earth'. Mountains tend to be favoured because it is from their summits that communication with the sky is easiest: the navel is thus the mid-point not just between different geographical zones, but between the upper and lower spheres. This idea is implied also in the Sumerian term *DUR-AN-KI* ('bond of the earth', a term for sanctuaries), although the Sumerians do not seem to have had the concept of the 'navel'. This is a suggestive idea in view of the role of Delphi in mediating between divine knowledge and the human plane—could the idea of the *ὀμφαλός* once have had a more direct involvement in the concept of prophecy?²

Pindar is the only early literary source for the myth of the eagles and the *ὀμφαλός*, but it seems unlikely that he invented it, because there is a contemporary iconographical parallel in representations of birds on either side of the Delphic *ὀμφαλός*. Pindar may refer to these at *Pyth.* 4. 4, where he says that the priestess delivered her prophecy³ *χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος* ('seated beside the golden

² The mythological implications have been studied by Roscher (1913) (esp. 56); (1915); (1918); H.-V. Herrmann (1959); Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), 225, 233 ff. (= (1991), 226–7, 235 ff.). Indian: Roscher (1913), 22, referring to *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 5. 16. 7; (1918), 2 ff. West Semitic: Wensinck (1916); Burrows (1935), 51; *ṭabbūr ha'areš* at Judges 9: 37. Mountains: Eliade (1976), 266 ff. ('the cosmic mountain'); Wensinck (1916), 23 ff. Mesopotamian: Burrows (1935); Roscher (1913), 23 ff.; Averbek (1987), 131 ff.

³ Cf. Σ at Dr ii. 95. 22 *ὅτι ὑπὸ Διὸς ἀφεθέντες ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς συνέπεσον ἐνταῦθα, καὶ οὕτως ἐγνώσθη τὸ μέσον τῆς γῆς. ὡν εἰκόνες οἱ χρυσοὶ ἀνέκειτο παρὰ τὸν ὀμφαλὸν αἰετοί· ἤρθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ Φωκικῷ πολέμῳ, ὃν συνεστήσατο Φιλόμηλος* ('because having been sent by Zeus from the ends of the earth they met there, and in this way the middle of the earth was discovered. Golden eagles were set up beside the *ὀμφαλός* as images of them. They were removed in the Phocian war, which Philomelos started'); also ii. 95. 4 *λόγος τις τοιοῦτος περιηχέι, ὅτι ὁ Ζεὺς καταμετρήσασθαι τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸ μεσαίτατον βουλευθεὶς ἴσους κατὰ τὸ τάχος αἰετοὺς ἐκ δύσεως καὶ ἀνατολῆς ἀφῆκεν*· οἱ δὲ διυπτάμενοι συνέπεσον ἀλλήλοις κατὰ τὴν Πυθῶνα, ὥστε τὴν σύμπωσαν ὀρίζειν αὐτόθι τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης τὸ μεσαίτατον. ὕστερον δὲ σημεῖον τοῦ γεγονότος καὶ χρυσοῦς αἰετοὺς κατασκευάσας ἀνέθηκε τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ τεμένει ('There is a story in circu-

eagles of Zeus'), a passage that suggests a series of images in which Themis or Apollo is represented seated on the ὀμφαλός.⁴ There may also be an allusion in Eur. *Ion*, 222–4.⁵ The motif of ὀμφαλός and birds also appears on an Attic lekythos from the early fifth century BC.⁶ The statues are reported to have been carried off by the Phocians during the Sacred War in the fourth century BC and replaced by a mosaic.⁷

H2 (fr. *55)

Πίνδαρός φησι πρὸς βίαν κρατῆσαι Πυθοῦς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, διὸ καὶ ταρταρώσαι ἐξήτει αὐτὸν ἡ Γῆ. (ΣAesch. *Eum.* 2. 5b, i. 43. 7 Smith)

lation that Zeus, wanting to measure the centre of the earth, sent out two eagles of identical speed from the west and from the east. They flew across the earth and met at Delphi, so that their meeting determined the centre of the world there. Later, as a memorial of what happened, he fashioned and set up golden eagles in the sanctuary of the god').

⁴ See Herrmann (1959), 103–4, esp. the Attic pelike, Leningrad, Hermitage 1793 (Herrmann, pl. 10. 1). Numismatic representations: e.g. *BMC Central Greece*, 27. 22, pl. 4. 13 (= *LIMC* s.v. *Apollon*, 306; Herrmann, pl. 11. 3); cf. also Plato, *Rep.* 427 c: (Apollo) ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ καθήμενος (sitting on the ὀμφαλός).

⁵ ΧΟΡΟΣ. ἄρ' ὄντως μέσον ὀμφαλὸν | γὰς Φοίβου κατέχει δόμος; | ἸΩΝ. στέμμασι γ' ἐνδυτόν, ἀμφὶ δὲ Γοργόνες (CHORUS. Does the house of Phoebus really occupy the central navel of the earth? ION. Yes, it is clad in wreaths, and around it are Gorgons). Cf. the discussion of Studniczka (1902), 258 ff. The representations would have had to be fairly abstract if they could be interpreted as Gorgons; unclarity in the representations might also explain Strabo's uncertainty about whether the birds were eagles or crows, and Plutarch's (*De def. orac.* 409 E) as to whether they were eagles or swans.

⁶ Black-figure lekythos attributed to the Haimon painter (480?; Haspels (1936), 242 n. 37, illustrated in Studniczka (1902) and in Roscher (1913), pl. 4. 3), which portrays the ὀμφαλός and birds between two warriors. Later representations include the Spartan relief, Sparta, Museum 468 (= *LIMC* s.v. *Apollon*, no. 679b), depicting Apollo and Artemis with ὀμφαλός and birds, which is now thought to be early 4th cent. BC, and the Cyzicean stater, probably from the same period (cf. von Fritze (1912), 220, pl. 6. 32).

⁷ Cf. *ΣPyth.* 4. 4, cited in n. 3 above, and Diod. 16. 30. The mosaic might be what is referred to by ΣLuc. *Salt.* 38, 188. 25 Rabe λέγουσιν ἐν Δελφοῖς ὀμφαλὸν εἶναι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδάφους τοῦ νεῶ καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν αἰετὸν γεγράφθαι ἀπὸ συνθέσεως λίθων καὶ τοῦτο ἔφασκον τὸ μέσον ἀπάσης τῆς γῆς (Ulrich: αἰετὸν γέγραπται MSS) ('They say that in Delphi an ὀμφαλός was on the foundation of the temple, and around it an image of an eagle was created out of a combination of stones, and they said that this was the centre of the earth').

Pindar says that Apollo took control of Delphi by force, for which reason Ge sought to send him to Tartarus.

Apollo's take-over of Delphi was a much-treated myth. The earliest literary version that we know of is in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, where Apollo is the first holder of the oracle but has to kill the dragon which nurtured Hera's offspring Typhon, an action which perhaps symbolized an overthrow of chthonic powers. Apollo's conflict with the dragon was also described by Simonides. The classic form of the myth is perhaps represented by the proem of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, where control passes from Ge to Themis, then to Phoebe, so that Apollo is only the fourth holder; this is much more complex than the version in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, though it has been argued that it is the *Homeric Hymn* that innovates, in order, perhaps, to represent Apollo as the original founder of the oracle.¹

Pindar's version seems to be somewhere between that of the *Homeric Hymn* and Aeschylus: as in the *Homeric Hymn*, Pindar implied that Apollo's arrival was violent, though our source does not specify whether he had Apollo kill the dragon; in contrast to the version of the *Homeric Hymn*, however, Apollo is not the first holder of the oracle, although the succession is not as complex as that described in the *Eumenides*. What is unique about Pindar's version is that Ge responds by attempting to send Apollo to Tartarus. The nearest parallel to this is the version in the third stasimon of Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* (1234 ff.), in which Ge resisted Apollo's take-over by sending prophetic dreams in order to undercut his monopoly over prophecy. In Pindar's version Ge's opposition is more violent. Banishment to Tartarus is not a punishment that would usually be meted out to an Olympian god; even when Apollo killed the Cyclops in revenge for Zeus' destruction of Asclepius, the punishment was only to serve Admetus for a year in Thessaly. Moreover, for Apollo to be cast into Tartarus would involve a profound transgression of categories, since Apollo's nature is to a large extent defined as being in opposition to all things chthonic. As Pindar implies in two passages of the *Pythians* (1. 13 ff.; 8. 17 ff.), it is the monstrous opponents of the Olympian gods that belong in Tartarus (the Delphic dragon is spared this

¹ *HH Ap.* 300 ff. The most complete account is Clay (1989), 61 ff.; also Förstel (1979), 235; for the chthonic element cf. line 363. Simonides: *PMG* 573 = Rutherford (1990), 192 ff. Aesch. *Eum.* 1–20: see Clay (1989); and Förstel (1979).

fate because it is not immortal). Pindar thus transformed the myth of Apollo's take-over of Delphi into a sharp conflict between the Olympian/Apollonian sphere and the chthonic. A similar engagement of these two categories in this myth can be glimpsed in A2, where Apollo or a ritual substitute standing in for him was probably represented as bathing in the Peneius—a river which is vicariously chthonic because it is bound with the Titaëssus—to effect, or enact, a purification from the pollution incurred in slaying the Delphic dragon.²

H3 (fr. 192)

Δελφοὶ θεμίστων μάντιες
Ἀπολλωνίδαι.

ΣPind. *Pyth.* 4. 3 (Dr ii. 95. 2)

θεμίστων ὕμνων μάντιες MS (ὕμνων deleted by Heyne as cited in Boeckh (1811–19), iii. 661); θεμίτων Turyn, Braswell ad *Pyth.* 4. 54

Delphian seers, masters of oracular decrees, sons of Apollo.

A *Paian* could well be the source for this, especially in view of the frequent references to seers in *Paianes*.¹ Note the close similarity to the start of B2. Seers who are 'the sons of Apollo' will include Tenerus and Iamus. θεμίστων are prophetic rulings.²

H4 (fr. 148)

ὀρχήστ' ἀγλαΐας ἀνάσσω, ἐνρυφάρετρ' Ἀπολλον.

¹ Eur. *IT* 1234 ff.: Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), 240=(1991), 241 n. 62. Service to Admetus: Eur. *Alc.*, proem. Apollo as non-chthonic: Stes. *PMG* 232; Soph. *TrGF* iv. 523 (*Polyxena*).

² See pp. 173–4.

³ Cf. A1. 41; *Ol.* 10. 24; perhaps also B2, 4. There is a good discussion in Vos (1956), 17–20; Braswell (1988), on *Pyth.* 4. 54, both rejecting this sense for Hom. *Od.* 16. 403 (which LSJ still allow); Lloyd-Jones (1971), 166–7 n. 23; Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), 240=(1991), 242 n. 65. The root is first attested as linked with prophecy at *HH Ap.* 253.

Athen. epit. 1, 40, p. 22b

Dancer ruling festivity, Apollo with the broad quiver.

Subject-matter suggests that this might be from a *Paian*. The metre does not suggest a fit anywhere in the surviving papyrus fragments. The fragment neatly sums up the two aspects of Apollo: song and warfare (see §11e).

H5 (fr. 193)

πενταετηρὶς ἑορτὰ
βουπομπός, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτον ἐνύασθην ἀγαπατὸς ὑπὸ σπαργάνοις.

Vit. Pind. Ambr. p. 2. 18 Dr

The penteteric festival to which cows are sent, in which I was first laid to rest well-loved beneath the covers.

This fragment seems to tie the birth of Pindar to the occurrence of a four-yearly festival at Delphi. The subject-matter suggests that the source might be a *Paian*, though the metre (probably to be considered dactylo-epitrite) does not fit with any other fragment. If the speaking subject refers to the poet, this differs from the choral reference of the speaking subject found in other Pindaric *Paianes*, but without the full context we cannot be sure that the ancient scholarly tradition interpreted the lines correctly.¹

¹ See p. 180.

Supplements

Supplement S: Dubious Paianes

Other Substantial Fragments of Π^7 and Π^{26}
that Probably Do Not Come from *Paianes*

Π^{26} certainly included *Paianes*, Π^7 may have done. Supplement S comprises larger fragments from these two papyri that show signs of coming from other genres. I observed earlier that the contents of Π^7 must have included either *Paianes* or *Prosodia* (and perhaps both). Two fragments have been dealt with already: G1 and G2. Π^7 also contributes S1–2, S3–4, and S5, some at least of which might be from *Prosodia*. Π^{26} probably represents a number of rolls written in the same sloping hand. It included fragments of Sappho first published as *POxy* 1787, and also a range of Pindaric genres, including *Epinikia*, *Humnoi*, and, of course, *Paianes* (it contributes to B2 and C1–2); I suggested above that another fragment might come from a *Paian* (G4). Besides, there are overlaps with some fragments of Π^7 when Π^7 is independent of Π^4 (S3–4; S1–2). The important remaining fragments are S6–9.

S1 (*Pa.* XX)

| | | | |
|--|------|--|------|
| | ~20 |] <td></td> | |
| .[| ~17 |]. | |
| .[]\iota\tau[| ~12 |]. .\nu\tau\omega\nu \beta\iota .[| |
| .[.]\alpha[| ~15 |]\pi' \textit{\text{A}\lambda\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\alpha} .[| < 12 |
| 5 \kappa[.]\chi .[| < 12 |] | |
| \epsilon^2\pi\alpha\gamma\omicron\mu[| ~8 | \mu\omicron\rho]\mu\omicron\rho\acute{\upsilon}\xi\iota\alpha\varsigma | |
| . .\mu\epsilon\nu .[| ~5 |]. [.]\delta[\iota]\grave{\alpha} \theta\nu\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta[| |
| \omicron\phi\iota\epsilon\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\pi\omicron\mu\pi[oi | < 5 |] | |

...ζ... ἐπὶ βρέφος οὐρανίου Διὸς
 10 ~5] [.] νθ', ὁ δ' ἀντίον ἀνὰ κάρᾳ τ' ἄειρ[ε < 6]
 ~5] χειρὶ μελέων ἄπο ποικίλον
 σπά[ρ]γανον ἔρριψεν ἑάν τ' ἔφανεν φυὰν
 ~4 ὁμμ]άτων ἄπο σέλας ἐδίνασεν.
 ~8] ἄπεπλος ἐκ λεχέων νεοτόκων
 15 ~7] οθ[.] νόρουσε περὶ φόβω.
 ~10] οἶκον Ἀμφιτρύωνος
 ~7 δει[ματι σχόμεναι φύγον
 ~10] . α παᾶσαι
 ~8] ἀ]μφίπολ[οι] Κεφ[αλ]λαν[< 4]
 20 ~10] . α . [~5] ηρᾶ[
 ~18] εσῆ[~1]
 ~18] ᾠν[< 10]
 ~30] . . 5

The basic text is P²⁶ fr. 32 col. 1; lines 6–10 are contributed by P⁷ fr. 31, lines 16–19 by P⁷ fr. 139

3] ΖΕ,] ΞΕ Α[, Λ[4 ΑΐΔ 5] ΡΧ,] ΥΧ? κ[α] νχα[Sn 6 ἐπαγομ[ένας
 Sn μορ] suppl. Lobel ΥΧΙΑC Π²⁶ 7 Π·Μ? ΡΑΝ Π ΕΠΕΙΔ[Π²⁶: ΕΠΙ[Π⁷
 8 ὉΦ suppl. Lobel 9] ΖΟ,] ΖΟ? βρίζον Sn] ΟΥ 10] ΝΘ· Π²⁶:] ΝΤ
 Π²⁶ ἐσσεύο] νθ' Sn ΚΑΡΑ Τ' Α suppl. Lobel 11 νέα τε] Sn 12 suppl.
 Lobel ΕΡΡΕΙΨΕΝ ΕΑΝΤ' Ε ΥΑΝ· 13 (left) τῶν τ' οἱ μέγα δ' Sn ΔΙΝΑ Ν·
 14 Ἀλκμήνα δ'] or ἀ δὲ μάτηρ] Sn] Α ΤΟ 15] οθ[ε]ν ὄρουσε or] ος [ἀ] νόρουσε
 Lobel; αὐτ]όθ' [ἀ] νόρουσε Sn περὶ φόβω or περιφόβω Lobel Ω· 16 Sn
 suggests λείποισαι] δ' or ταὶ δὲ κα]τ', understanding ἀμφίπολοι 17 Lobel Υ
 18] ΛΑ? ΠΑC 19] Π ΑΝ[suppl. Lobel from Σ 20] ΓΑΡ, ΤΑ!

Σ 18 ἡ Κεφαλλή(νη) πρότερον τοῦ Ἀ]μφιτρυῶ(νος) Δουλίχιο(ν) ἐκαλείτο· ἦν δ'
 ὑπὸ τὸν Πτερέλαον· ἀ(πὸ) δ(ὲ) Κεφάλ(ου) τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔσχ[εν]

21] ολο[< 8]

23 (between the columns) ἀν(τὶ τοῦ) ὕμνη[~?

... The grandson of Alcaeus ... terrorizings ... through the doors ...
 heaven-sent snakes ... to the baby of heavenly Zeus ... he raised his head
 against ... with a hand threw a decorated swaddling band away from his
 limbs and revealed his nature ... from eyes a flash whirled ... without a
 robe ... she leapt in fear from the bed of recent childbirth ... the home
 of Amphitryon ... possessed by fear they fled ... all ... the Cephallenian
 maidservants ...

(18) Cephallene was called Doulichion before the time of Amphitryon; it was under

Pterelaus; its name is derived from Cephalus . . . (23) Instead of 'was sung' (?) [cf. Σ D4. 4]

The main fragments of S1 and S2 are from consecutive columns of Π²⁶. The top and bottom sections of both columns have been lost. If columns of Π²⁶ contained about 40 lines,¹ there will be about 17 lines from the end of S1 to the start of S2.

S1 is a description of the birth of Heracles. For a fragment this small it is remarkable how many details can be made out: Heracles is playing with something (line 6);² the snakes come in (line 8), Heracles is roused and reveals his physique (lines 10–14),³ Alcmena jumps out of the bed she has just given birth in (line 15), slaves from Cephallenia run away in panic (lines 17–19).⁴ The killing of the snakes presumably followed. This scene is a doublet of the description of the birth of Heracles at *Nem.* 1. 38 ff.: although there are only a few precise verbal parallels, the ideas are for the most part the same, the presentation in *Nemean* 1 being perhaps a little more detailed (e.g. Hera's anger specified in lines 37–8; the vicious desire of the snakes in line 42).⁵ Aspects of these Pindaric descriptions are reflected in contemporary vase-painting.⁶

There are no positive indications about the genre; not enough of the song survives for us to know whether it had a *παῖάν* refrain. Heracles sometimes has *παῖνες* addressed to him, though the only example from the classical period is the second stasimon of Euripides' *Heracles*.⁷ The question of how the song was classified in the ancient edition cannot be addressed without also considering the

¹ Length of columns of Π²⁶: p. 165 n. 5.

² *μωρ]μωρύξιας* is a hapax, perhaps denoting some sort of game or toy supposed to scare children (cf. *μωρμωρύξει· ἐκφοβεῖς* in Phot. *Lex.* i. 428 Naber), which Heracles can be supposed to have resisted.

³ This Homeric sense of *φύαν* (LSJ s.v. 1) is also found at *Pyth.* 4. 235.

⁴ These will presumably be slaves that Amphitryon captured when campaigning against the Taphians and Teleboans, on which episode see also p. 426.

⁵ So Schürch (1971), 78–9. Zanker (1987), 176, mentions S1 in the course of a discussion of the accounts of the episode in *Nemean* 1 (heroic) and Theocr. 24 (domestic), and suggests that S1 is closer to the latter than to the former: for example, in S1 Heracles kicks off the blanket ('stripping himself for action') while in Theocr. 24. 25 it is Iphicles that kicks off the blanket in terror ('drawing attention to the more ordinary boy's behaviour'); he also thinks that *μωρ]μωρύξιας* adds a touch of 'domestic colour'.

⁶ *LIMC* s.v. 'Herakles', 827 ff., particularly nos. 1650–1 (= Alcmena 8–9), which are vases from c. 480–475, on which one can see the infant Heracles' clothing falling away and Alcmena and the maids fleeing in horror. See also Woodford (1983).

⁷ For Heracles as an addressee of *παῖνες* see p. 136.

classification of S2. There is a remote chance that S7 (q.v.) was the beginning of this song.

S2 (*Pa.* XXI)

str. A

....].μορ.[
]ουρανι[
^{5.11.11.15} ιῆ ιῆ βασίλειαν Ὀλυ[μ]πίω[ν]
 νύμφαν ἀριστόπο[σ]ιν

6

str. B

5 το...ἐναν...[
 λιπεῖν δ'...[
 .].ῥξων τις εἶδα.[
 ...].ι.μακαρο...[
 ἀλλὰν Ἀχελωῖου
 10 κρανίον τοῦτο ζάθε[ον,
 ἰῆ ἰῆ βασίλειαν Ὀλυ[μ]πίω[ν]
 — νύμφαν ἀριστόπο[σ]ιν.

3

6

str. C

ἔσσεται γὰρ ἀδυ[
 ἄεναος ὡσο.
 15 ἄστεϊ κτεάν[
 ναύταις δ' α.[
 σχήσει πολι.[— —
 ἄνθρωπο
 ἰῆ ἰῆ βασίλειαν Ὀλυ[μ]πίω[ν]
 20 νύμφαν ἀριστόπο[σ]ιν

3

6

str. D

ἔτι δ' ἀνδρ...[.].[
 τοῦτ, ν πορ...[
 ...[
 24 η.[

3

* * *

(27?) ἰῆ ἰῆ βασίλειαν Ὀλυ[μ]πίω[ν]
 νύμφαν ἀριστόπο[σ]ιν.

str. E (?)

]ατοδαμ[

Π¹⁶ fr. 32 col. 2; Π⁷ fr. 24 (=lines (27)–(29) here) could belong before or after the main fragment; the other parts of the refrain (position indeterminate): Π⁷ fr. 55 ἰὴ ἰὲ βα[σίλ[ειαν Ὀλυμπίων | νύμφ]αν ἀ[ριστόποσιν; Π⁷ fr. 83 ἰὴ ἰὲ βασιλείαν Ὀλυμπ[ίων[| νύμφαν ἀριστόποσιν]; Π⁷ fr. 84 (=Z11–12 here) could represent the end of the song: νύμφ]αν ἀ[ριστόποσιν | * | ...], ραπ[, if it does not represent the last line of D2 and the first of D3. 27–9

3–4 Lobel from Π⁷ 4 ΦAN; 12 ΦAN, 20 ΦAN or ΦAN 5 perhaps ΤΟΥΤ
6 ΛΙΠΕΙΝ Π¹⁶: ΛΕΙΠΕΙΝ Π¹⁶ 7 ἀέ]ξων e.g. Lobel τις ἐδάη[Rutherford (i.e. a
gnome) 8]Α,]Λ I,M or IM 13 *ΑΔ, *ΑΛ 14 ΑΕ 15 ΕΙ ΕΑ
16 Δ' Α Λ[18 ΑΝ

Ie ie, queen of the Olympians, wife with the best husband . . . to leave . . . someone . . . blessed . . . strength of Achelous, this holy fountain. *Ie ie*, queen of the Olympians, wife with the best husband. For there will be sweet . . . eternal . . . for the city a possession . . . and for sailors . . . he will hold . . . man . . . *Ie ie*, queen of the Olympians, wife with the best husband. Still a man . . . *Ie ie*, queen of the Olympians, wife with the best husband . . .

The song contained a regular refrain (3–4 = 11–12 = 19–20) invoking a goddess as 'queen of the Olympians'. SnMae print the refrain as complete, with the invocation ἰὴ ἰὲ taking an accusative object, a construction that may be present also at D6. 121–2.¹ However, we should not rule out the possibility that the first line of the refrain could have ended with a verb.

The song could have one of two structures. Since the refrain occurs at the end of three successive stanzas, one naturally thinks of a monostrophic structure. However, a coronis occurs at line 4, and nowhere else, indicating that this stanzaic division was more important than those at lines 12 and 20. In that case, was the structure triadic, with a refrain at the end of strophe, antistrophe, and epode? No such examples are known, but why should we rule them out? Or has an editor divided up a monostrophic song into subdivisions of three stanzas, giving a false impression of a triadic structure? A point in favour of the first possibility is that line 21, which in a triadic structure would be the first line of a second epode, is metrically dissimilar to line 13, which would be the first line of the strophe. But the matter is not clear.

Who is the goddess? Hera is θεῶν βασίλεια ('queen of the gods') at

¹ See p. 317.

Nem. 1. 39, ἀθανάτων βασίλειαν ('queen of the immortals') at *Homeric Hymn* 12. 2;² νύμφαν also suggests Hera.³ Demeter is βασίλεια at Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 382 ff. ἀριστόπο[σιν] could refer to any wife of Zeus.⁴ On balance, Hera must be likely, though there is an outside chance that it might be Leto, considering the paeanic associations of the refrain.⁵

The rest sheds little light. ἀλλὰν Ἀχελωΐου in line 9 is an instance of the periphrastic use of ἀλλά + genitive found elsewhere in Pindar. Ἀχελωΐου is probably a metonymy for water in general. In this context, it seems likely that κρανίον in the next line means 'little fountain' rather than 'skull'.⁶ The subject of ἔσσεται . . . | ἀέναος could well have been water.⁷ The future tense suggests that this sentence could well be part of a prophecy in direct speech.⁸

It is possible to make a guess about the ritual function of the song. It would suit the combination of goddess and fountain if the original performance had been linked to a ritual commemorating the sacred bathing of a goddess, of the sort that was represented ritually by the bathing of a statue.⁹ There are numerous examples:

1. Callimachus' *Fifth Hymn* describes a ritual in which Athena is represented by a statue.¹⁰

2. In the Athenian Plunteria the cult statue of Athena was carried to Phaleron every June, ritually bathed, and carried back.¹¹

3. A similar festival in which a statue was taken to the sea was the Samian Tonaia, in honour of Hera. The statue of the goddess

² For other cases see Bruchmann (1893), s.v. "Ἥρα.

³ At Call. *Hym.* 4. 215 νύμφα Διὸς βαρύθυμῃ. Marriage belongs to Hera's sphere: see F. Haug, *RE* s.v. *Hera* xv. 392 ff.; Roscher (1884–1937), s.v. 2098 ff.

⁴ A hapax, though Opp. *Cyn.* 1. 6 has the similar νύμφη ἀριστοπόσεια ('bride with an excellent husband').

⁵ βασίλεια is used of Leto in *Orphic Hymn* 35. 2.

⁶ This interpretation is favoured by Lobel (1961), 54.

⁷ ἀλλά + genitive: *Nem.* 3. 38; *Isth.* 4. 35. Metonymic Ἀχελώϊος: S5 (c) 10–11; perhaps also in fr. 249b (=70). Common in drama, e.g. Soph. *TrGF* iv. 5 (*Athamas*); Eur. *Ba.* 625; Aesch. *TrGF* iii. 351; Achaëus, *TrGF* i. 20 fr. 9. 1. κρανίον; for κρηνίον LSJ cite *ID* 290. 75 (3rd cent. BC); Strabo 3. 4. 17; *IG Rom.* iv. 1657 (Almura). 'Ever-flowing water': Hes. *Op.* 595 κρήνης αἰεταίου ('ever-flowing fountain'); Sim. *PMG* 582. 2; alternatively, the reference could be to an eternally practised rite, as at *Ol.* 14. 12.

⁸ ἄσσει in line 15 corresponds to ἀστοίσι τε in the prophecy at A2. 13 and σχήσει πολι. [in line 17 to πολιόχ[in A2. 12.

⁹ Ginouvès (1962), 283 ff.; Fehrle (1910), 171 ff.; Burkert (1967), 294 ff.; see also p. 413.

¹⁰ See Bulloch (1985), 8–9; Ginouvès (1962), 293.

¹¹ Bulloch (1985); Fehrle (1910), 171 ff.; Parke (1977), 152 ff.; Ginouvès (1962), 292 ff.

seems to have been taken down to the sea, washed, and brought back. Here there was an aetiological myth attached to the rite: the statue was once stolen by pirates, but they were unable to set sail with the statue on board and they left it on the shore.¹²

4. Pausanias reports that Hera recovered her virginity every year at Canathos near Nauplia, and this myth is sometimes thought to reflect a ritual bathing of a statue.¹³

5. We also hear of such rituals in connection with Artemis. A late source seems to provide the aetiology of a festival in which a cult statue of Artemis was taken to a place called Daitis and ritually feasted by young men and women.¹⁴

6. Euripides' *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* may preserve reflexes of a ritual of a sacred washing of a cult statue of Artemis. Euripides represented Iphigeneia as removing the statue on the pretext that it had been defiled and needed to be washed in the sea.¹⁵ Here, then, washing is a pretext for removal, whereas in the statue-washing rituals we have seen it is a preliminary to reintegration. As a whole, the play could be seen as providing an aetiology for the origins of the cult statue of Artemis Tauropolos at Halae Araphenides on the east coast of Attica, and it is quite possible that it reflects an otherwise unattested statue-washing ritual at that place, re-enacting the origin of the statue.

7. Again, at Ancyra statues of Artemis and Athena were bathed every year even in the fifth century AD.¹⁶

For Aphrodite we have no epigraphical evidence, though Ginouvès suggests that many depictions of Aphrodite immersed in water should be interpreted as depictions of her statue being washed.¹⁷ Ritual purification of this sort seems to be a cross-cultural phenomenon, for analogous rites are known from Syria.¹⁸

Lobel made no guess as to the genre in the *editio princeps*, but SnMae class the fragment as a *παίδιον*. There are perhaps two reasons

¹² Athen. 672 c; Fehrle (1910), 173 ff.; Ginouvès (1962), 289 n. 6; Nilsson (1906), 46–9; Graf (1985), 93–6.

¹³ Paus. 2. 38. 2–3; *EM* 436. 49 s.v. *Ἡραϊδες*; Hesych. ii. 293 (Latte) s.v. *Ἡραϊδες*; Antimachus fr. 179 Wyss, col. II. 17; Ginouvès (1962), 288–9; Nilsson (1906), 45.

¹⁴ The source is *EM* 252. 11 s.v. *Δαιρίς*. See Fehrle (1910), 174, referring to Heberday (1904); Ginouvès (1962), 291 and n. 6; Nilsson (1906), 345–6; Calame (1977a), 179 ff. ¹⁵ 1039–41, 1199, etc.; Ginouvès (1962), 290 and n. 7.

¹⁶ Brinkmann (1905), 160, referring to Franchi de Cavalieri (1891); Ginouvès (1962), 291 and n. 11. ¹⁷ Ginouvès (1962), 294 ff.

¹⁸ Luc. *Dea Syria*, 33, 47; Aelian, *HA* 12. 30; Ginouvès (1962), 296 ff.

. [~8] . αθυ[
 30] . λα . . α . [. .] . γ . [] . [
 -10 εὐδοξίας δ' ἐπίχειρα δε[-6
] θε· λίγεια μὲν Μοῖσ' ἀφα . [
 μων τελευταῖς ὀαρίζε[ι
 λόγον τερπνῶν ἐπέων [
 35 μνάσει δὲ καί τινα ναίο[ν-
 -5 θ' ἐκὰς ἡρωῖδος
 θεαρίας· βασανι- -3
 σθέντι δὲ χρυσῷ τέλος . [
 γνώμας δὲ ταχείας συν[
 40 σοφία γὰρ ἀείρεται πλε[ι]

Π²⁹ fr. 1 col. i and col. 2. 1-15; lines 37-40 are preserved also in lines 1-4 of Π²⁸ 8 (Π²⁹ fr. 30+65+lines 1-4 of a new fragment). For the unusual flattened capitals of Π²⁹ see Leone (1976)

11 After N either a mark of punctuation or an uncertain letter 13 οὔτ' ἐχθρά
 στάσις, (from Σ) Sn 20 Σ (Lobel) 26 Κ'Α 30]ΑΛ,]ΛΑ]ΓΟ,]ΤΕ[
 31]Α ΠΙΧ δε[ξαι τηλό-]θε e.g. Sn; δε[ξο Rutherford 32 ΘΕ· ΑΙΓ ΟΙC Γ[,
 perhaps Π[, Ρ[, ΙΤ[32-3 ἄφαρ [ἐν κώ-]μων e.g. Sn; ἀφ' ἀγ[ν- γά]μων Ferrari (1992a)
 33 ΤΑΙC ΠΙZ suppl. Lobel 34 [φέροισα Sn 35 ΚΑΙ ΝΑΙ suppl.
 Lobel 36 Θ'· Ε Ι 37 ΑΡΙ C 38 Μ[, Λ[, Χ[μ[ανύεται Sn; τ[ιμά
 van Groningen (1963) 40 ΦΙΑΙ πλεῖστα or πλεῖστ' ἀρετά Sn; πλεῖστάκι van
 Groningen (1963)

Σ 13 . . . ε . θρα στάσις οὐ βιάζα, οὐ(τως) τιν(ές)

15 κατὰ]τὴν διὰ πρόθ(εσιν), ἢ' ἥ[~?]

20 ἐν ἀοιδᾷ

13 perhaps βρα; οὔτ' ἐχθρά, ἀβρά Lobel (doubtfully) 15 κατὰ Rutherford (cf.
 Dr ii. 26. 17, 107. 2; iii. 58. 22)

. . . [not hated revolution] . . . in songs . . . comrades . . . city bronze . . .
 wages consisting in renown . . . the clear-voiced Muse . . . in the rites speaks
 a speech of pleasant words, and it will put even someone dwelling far away
 in mind of the heroic spectacle. When gold has been tested the final mark
 (comes to it?). Swift judgement (is a bad thing?). For by wisdom is raised
 (true worth? success?)

(13) . . . hated (?) revolution: not by force, according to some. (15) (By way of) the
 preposition διὰ, so that it is as if . . . (20) In song.

Lines 31-2 seem to be about wages consisting in good renown,¹

¹ Wages for good fame (like ἀρετῆς ἐπίχειρα ('wages for virtue') at Plato, *Rep.*

which someone is presumably about to receive, probably the hon-
orand of the song. For the thought compare *Ol.* 7. 77 ff.:

τόθι λύτρον συμφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς γλυκὺ Τλαπτολέμῳ
ἴσταται Τίρυνθίων ἀρχαγέτα,
ὥσπερ θεῶ
μήλων τε κνισσάεσσα πομπὰ καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις.

(There a recompense for pitiful suffering is set up for Tleptolemus, found-
ing hero of the Tirynthians, just as to a god, a procession of sheep rich in
the smell of meat, and a competition over prizes.)

The word λύτρον here is parallel to ἐπίχειρα in S3. 31, though it
governs an objective genitive (recompense *for* misfortune), whereas
the genitive governed by ἐπίχειρα is appositional (wages *consisting*
in renown). What follows (lines 32–7) specifies two functions of
poetry. The first, introduced by μέν, is that the Muse converses
(δαρίζει)² at the rites (τελευταίς): that is, she provides music that
is used in the celebration itself (lines 32–4).³ The second function,
introduced by δέ, is less clear. The sense seems to be something like:
'The Muse (understood from line 32) will put in mind of the ἡρωῖδος
θεαρίας even someone dwelling far away from it.' The word ἡρωῖδος
could be (1) a noun with the sense 'heroine', or (2) an adjective
with the sense 'pertaining to a hero' (known, for example, from
A.R. 1. 1048 τιμαῖς ἡρώσι), or (3) the name of a festival, the Herois,
known from Delphi (Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 293 c).⁴ The word θεαρίας could
be (1) a noun with the sense 'contemplation' or 'sacred embassy';
(2) an adjective with the sense 'pertaining to a sacred embassy', or
(3) a proper noun, 'Thearia', perhaps the name of a heroine, which
would be otherwise unattested—though the masculine 'Thearios'
is known as an epithet of Apollo at Trozen.⁵

608 c) is less likely than 'wages *consisting in* good fame' (like ξιφείων ἐπίχειρα ('wages
consisting in the sword')) at Soph. *Ant.* 820).

² 'Utter softly' is the basic meaning, particularly in the context of lovers' discourse.
Pindar uses the word of poetry at *Nem.* 7. 69; 3. 11. At Π²⁶ fr. 93 we find οαρ[, but
there is no context for this. Here λόγον could be an internal accusative, as at *HH*
23. 3.

³ This interpretation of τελευταίς is implied in SnMae's apparatus. For τελευτή =
'rite' (rare) see Waanders (1983), 241. The other possible meaning for τελευταίς is
'end', as it is taken by Waanders (1983), 243; van Groningen (1963), 128: 'The Muse
attaches a tale of delightful verses to the results of'. But the general context suggests
cult, so I incline to the interpretation 'rites'.

⁴ Halliday (1928), 71. Slater (1969a) suggests that the word might be the name of
a festival.

⁵ *IG* iv. 748. 16 (Trozen, 4th cent. BC); Paus. 2. 13. 6.

The number of possible permutations is reduced greatly if we recognize that *θεαρίας* is probably a noun, since the adjective is extremely rare and we have no special reason to posit the existence of a heroine Thearia. If that is the case, then the word *ἥρωϊδος* will most likely be an adjective in agreement with it. What might *ἥρωϊς θεαρία* mean? One possibility is 'heroic sight': the speaker will remind even someone who lives out of sight of the hero—perhaps where the hero cannot see him, since heroes, like other deities, are sometimes conceived of as watchers.⁶ Alternatively, it might mean 'sacred delegation in honour of a hero' (though this would be difficult to interpret) or 'sacred spectacle in honour of a hero'. On the last interpretation, the poet is saying that the song will remind of the festival (*θεαρίας* with *μνάσει* rather than *έκας*) even people unable to visit it because they dwell far away.⁷ The song is thus represented as imitating the movement of *θεωροί* returning to their home cities.

For the use of the adjective compare the expression at Plato, *Rep.* 517 D 3, which describes a man who has been on an intellectual journey to a higher plane of existence and returns to the world of men, coming *ἀπὸ θείων . . . θεωριῶν* ('from divine viewings'), like a *θεωρός* returning home.⁸ In this passage Plato is probably alluding to the folk etymology that connected the word *θεωρία* with *θεός*,⁹ and if Pindar is aware of this also, the expression *ἥρωϊδος θεαρίας* would be reminiscent of the oxymoron *ἥρωις θεός* used of Heracles at *Nem.* 3. 2. (In that case this passage would provide quite a powerful defence against Maas's suggestion that *ἥρωις θεός*, which concisely

⁶ Ar. *PCG* iii/2 fr. 322 (*Heroes*) *κἀναθροῦντες τοὺς ἀδίκους | καὶ κλέπτας καὶ λαποδύτας* ('watching the unjust, the thieves and robbers'); similarly, Hes. *Op.* 122–3 *τοὶ μὲν δαίμονες ἀγνοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι καλέονται | ἐσθλοί, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων* ('The holy spirits who wander the earth are called good, warding off evil, guards of mortal men'). That *θεαρία* might be used in the sense of a deity watching over mortals is at least suggested by Aesch. *Cho.* 246, where Orestes asks Zeus to become *θεωρός* of what is happening.

⁷ In their apparatus SnMae suggest that *τινα* might be Pindar ('sc. Pindarum qui ipse non adest in hac "theoria"?'). They are presumably thinking of the situation in some of the *Epinikia* where Pindar is not witnessing the performance of the song, and they may also have in mind passages of the *Epinikia* in which Pindar describes a hero as his *γείτων*. But surely *τινα* would be a strange way to refer to the poet. On the sense of *θεωρία* see Rutherford (2000c).

⁸ Rausch (1982), 48 ff., discusses the religious background of *θεωρία* in Plato.

⁹ Philod. *Mus.* 1. 23. 15 ff. Krevelan; ps.-Plut. *Mus.* 1140 E. The etymology is perhaps implied also in Arist. *NE* 10. 7. 1; on the etymology see Ziehen (1934), 2243–4; Bill (1901), *DELG*, s.v.; Rausch (1982), ch. 1. On this logic the expression *θείων . . . θεωριῶν* ('divine pilgrimages') at Plato, *Rep.* 517 D 3, turns out to be a *figura etymologica*.

conveys the ambiguous status of Heracles between hero and god, should be emended away to ἥρως θεός.¹⁰

These reflections about poetry are continued in the last four lines. The thought consists of three statements: first, something along the lines of 'the ultimate proof of the genuineness of gold is to test it';¹¹ second, something about 'fast opinion', perhaps a condemnation of hasty judgements of value; and third, an explanation: wisdom is the instrument to something, perhaps to accurate judgements of value. On the literal level all of this is about gold, but the implied subject is poetry. The 'fast opinion' and 'wisdom' are perhaps not just the intellectual faculties used in determining the worth of the poetry, but those used in its composition (compare parallel passages such as the end of *Olympian* 1 and Ibycus, *PMG* 282). In any case, the implicit thought is that this is a song of lasting value, so that its function is similar to that of a poetic σφραγίς—a reference to the poet, often at the start or finish of the song, signifying, like a seal, its provenance and guaranteeing its authenticity.¹²

S4 (*Pa.* XV)

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------|
| str. A | ‡ | τῷδ' ἐν ἄματι τερπνῷ |
| A[ι]γινήταις | | ἵπποι μὲν ἀθάναται |
| εἰ[ς] Αἰακόν | | Ποσειδᾶνος ἄγοντ' Αἰακ[|
| | | Νηρεὺς δ' ὁ γέρων ἔπετα[ι· |
| 5 | χ | πατὴρ δὲ Κρονίων μολ[οῦσι |
| | | πρὸς ὄμμα βαλὼν χερσὶ |
| | | τράπεζαν θεῶν ἐπ' ἀμβ[ρο |
| | | — ἵνα οἱ κέχεται πιεῖν ν. [|
| str. B | | ἔρχεται δ' ἐνιαυτῷ |
| 10 | | ὑπερτάταν [··]ονα |
| | | · [|

¹⁰ Maas (1954). Since this status was something specially associated with Heracles (see pp. 114–15 and n. 118), one might wonder if this is not an oblique indication that S3 is in honour of Heracles.

¹¹ Gold is a subject for gnomic statements concerning value at fr. 122. 15; *Pyth.* 10. 67; *Nem.* 8. 20; 4. 82–3; Bacch. fr. 14 (from a ὑπόρχημα: Stob. 3. 11. 19), fr. 33.

¹² The poetic σφραγίς is discussed by Kranz (1961). Rutherford (1997a), 47, includes a discussion of songs by Pindar that end with references to song.

Π²⁹ fr. 1 col. 2. 16–26; 1–4 Π⁷ fr. 30+65+a new fragment (=Π^{7*} 8); 6 ff. Π⁷ fr. 69 (Lobel (1961), 18)

3 Αἰακ[όν, Αἰακ[ῶ Ψαμάθ(ει)αν or Αἶγιναν, Αἰακ[ίδα Θέτω Sn 4 Lobel 5 μο-
 λ[ούσι πελάζει Lobel; μολ[ούσι εὐφρον Sn 6 [φίλα δέχεται Sn 7 [ροσίαν, [ρόταν,
 [ρότων Lobel 8 ἸΝΑ·ΟΙ νῆ[κταρ Lobel 10 Ὡ ἈΤΑΝ ΝΑ; perhaps [ὑπ]δ
 Να-|ῖθα 11 ![, M[

On this pleasant day the immortal mares of Poseidon lead . . . and old Nereus follows. Father Zeus . . . coming . . . casting his eye, with his hand . . . to the immortal table of the gods, where . . . ? . . . is poured out for him to drink. At the end of a year there comes . . . the highest . . .

We begin with the title. I take it to represent an inference made by a Hellenistic editor on the basis of the complete text of the song, to the effect that it was in honour of Aiakos and that it was performed by an Aeginetan χορός. We have no reason to doubt its reliability. The festival may well have been the Aiakeia. We know this only as an athletic festival,¹ but it is likely to have had other dimensions also. A panhellenic athletic competition is perhaps not likely to have taken place every year, but for all we know the Aiakeia itself was yearly, serving as the occasion for panhellenic games only every two or four years.

A comparison immediately suggests itself with the cult song in honour of Artemis Aphaea mentioned by Pausanias.² The existence of at least a third song performed by an Aeginetan χορός can be inferred from the title ΑΙΓΙΝΗ[ΤΑΙΣ ΕΙΣ found in a fragment of another papyrus (Z24). There will no doubt have been many more.

The song opened with a present-tense description: on this sacred day the mares of Poseidon are bringing someone or something—who or what is unclear. Αἰακ[probably represents either the direct or the indirect object of the verb. If it is the latter, the person being

¹ Pind. *Ol.* 7. 86 with Σ (Dr i. 232. 17), and *Nem.* 5. 78 with Σ (Dr iii 97. 9 ff.), which talks about a contest involving the carrying of jars of water (the ὕδροφορία). The aetiology for this was a visit by the Argonauts to Aegina on their return voyage: see A.R. 4. 1765 ff.; Call. *Iamb.* 8 (=fr. 198) with *Diegesis* col. 8; *EGen* (A) s.v. ἀμφορίτης ἀγών (cited by Pfeiffer), which places the contest by the Ἀσωπὶς κρήνη. The ὕδροφορία need not be part of the Aiakeia. It is easy to imagine that the aetiology of the Aiakeia as a whole might have been the visit by the leaders of the Greeks to Aegina during the great drought (see pp. 331 ff.). We may have the aetiology of the pentathlon at the Aiakeia in the myth that Telamon and Peleus killed Phocus after challenging him to a pentathlon (Paus. 2. 29. 9). In ΣPind. *Ol.* 7. 86 the syllable οἰ followed by a lacuna is restored by Drachmann (Dr i. 232. 21) as Οἰνώναια, implying that this was an alternative name for the festival, though Pfeiffer (ad fr. 198) restores Ὑδροφορία.

² Paus. 2. 30. 3 = Pind. fr. 89b.

brought would probably be someone else, e.g. Aiakos' Nereid wife Psamatheia. The presence of Nereus is also compatible with the hypothesis that the theme had to do with a wedding, since he would be the father-in-law. The wedding of Thetis and Peleus seems to be ruled out because that took place on Pelion.³

The idea of the mares of Poseidon transporting Aiakos or someone else might suggest a mythological narrative, but for the present tense. At least, the only ways of reconciling mythological narrative with this tense would be to suppose that the song opens in direct speech or that it was a sort of dramatic dialogue along the lines of Bacch. 18; but these seem remote possibilities. It is much more likely that this is a description of a sacred event conceived as happening in present time, like an epiphany of a god. In that case τῶδ' ἐν ἄματι in the first line is a deictic reference, such as we find at *Pyth.* 4. 2 or *Ol.* 6. 28, or at the start of Theocles' *Ithyphallus* (*CA* 173): θύσαμεν γὰρ σήμερον Σωτήρια | πάντες οἱ τεχνίται ('Today we held the sacrifice of the Soteria, all the artists'). The word ἐνιαυτῶ in line 9 perhaps indicates that the sacred event was thought of as happening yearly, and was not a unique occurrence, such as the inauguration of a temple.⁴

Such a ritual in present time might well reflect and re-enact a mythical event. There is a good example of how a ritual event described in the present tense can reflect a mythical occurrence described in the past tense at *Pyth.* 5. 77–88, a passage framed by an account of the arrival in Cyrene of Theran colonists led by Aristoteles:

πολύθυτον ἔρανον
 ἔνθεν ἀναδεξάμενοι,
 Ἄπολλον, τεῶ,
 80 Καρνήϊ, ἐν δαιτὶ σεβίζομεν
 Κυράνας ἀγακτιμέναν πόλιν
 ἔχοντι τὰν χαλκοχάρμαι ξένοι
 Τρῶες Ἀντανορίδαι· σὺν Ἑλένῃ γὰρ μόλον,
 —καπνωθεῖσαν πάτραν ἐπεὶ ἴδον

³ In their apparatus SnMae allow for both possibilities (Psamatheia for Aiakos; Thetis for Peleus). Another point against the wedding of Thetis and Peleus is the title of the song in the papyrus, which surely implies that the focal figure is Aiakos. Less likely still is the possibility that the mares would be bringing Aiakos' mortal bride Endeis from her home in Megara.

⁴ This sense of ἐνιαυτῶ seems to be 'at a year's end', as in the Gortyn Law Code (*IC* ii. 72), col. 1. 36, 47. Otherwise the dative without preposition seems to occur only when the year is specified by an ordinal.

85 ἐν Ἀρεὶ τὸ δ' ἐλάσιππον ἔθνος ἐνδυκέως
 δέκονται θυσίαισιν ἄνδρες οἰχνεόντες σφε δωροφόροι,
 τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλης ἄγαγε ναυσὶ θοαῖς
 ἀλὸς βαθεῖαν κέλευθον ἀνοίγων.

(Receiving a feast of many sacrifices from there (Thera), Apollo Carneius, we revere the strongly founded city of Cyrene in your feast, the city which is occupied by the Trojan sons of Antenor, strangers with bronze spears. They came with Helen when they saw their native city turned to smoke in war. The horse-driving race is kindly received at the sacrifice by men who visit them bearing gifts, the men whom Aristoteles brought in swift ships, opening the deep path of the sea.)

Here Pindar deals rapidly with two arrivals in Cyrene—that of the Antenoridai and that of the Therans—and three temporal stages: mythical past, historical past, and present. The pronoun *τούς* must refer to the Theran colonists, but the antecedent (*ἄνδρες οἰχνεόντες . . . δωροφόροι*) seems to be their descendants, the present-day inhabitants of Cyrene, since the present tense of the verb most probably refers to a contemporaneous action and not a historical event.⁵ The meaning of the lines must be that the Cyrenaeans receive the Antenoridai (τὸ δ' ἐλάσιππον ἔθνος) in a theoxenic festival, which re-enacts their mythological arrival from Troy.⁶

The sacred event described in S4 seems to be thought of as a procession with at least two components: the mares of Poseidon leading, bringing someone or other, and Nereus following. Perhaps these mythological figures were represented by statues which were transported in a sacred procession that was believed to re-enact the mythical event. A statue of Psamatheia might have been taken down to the sea and ritually cleansed (such cleansing rituals seem to have been commonly associated with the idea of *ἱερός γάμος*).⁷

The last two lines of the first stanza seem to refer to a feast, perhaps a wedding feast, and they suggest that the gods attended and dined. Thus, the festival was a *θεοξένια*, and S4 would be one

⁵ See the excellent discussion in Krummen (1990), 117 ff., who talks about the 'doppelte Zeitebene' (120, 124). She rightly rejects the idea that the passage might refer to the Antenoridai, the original colonists of Cyrene, receiving the Theran colonists; this would not so naturally be described in the present tense.

⁶ Krummen (1990), 120 ff., has an excellent discussion of the theoxenic aspects of the festival.

⁷ Above, pp. 404–5. For the bath and the ritual of marriage see Ginouvès (1962), 265 ff.; washing of statues of gods was sometimes also a prenuptial or postnuptial gesture: Ginouvès (1962), 295. On ritual marriage in general see Klinz (1933), esp. 64; Avagianou (1991).

of a number of songs believed to have been performed in connection with theoxenic festivals.⁸ The only evidence for an Aeginetan *θεοξένια* previously known is a scholion on *Nemean* 7 which reports the myth that Aiakos once entertained Heracles, and has been taken to reflect a theoxenic ritual. If that inference is right, the ritual might for all we know be the same as the one referred to in S4.⁹

This is one possible reconstruction. A different set of solutions suggests itself if we allow that Aiakos may have been driving the chariot, and that the ritual may not have been primarily a *ἱερός γάμος*. The main reason for thinking of a marriage ritual was the presence of Nereus, but that could equally be explained as a symbol of Aeginetan sea power. An initial difficulty with this hypothesis is that there is no parallel for the ritual transportation of statues in the cult of heroes. However, the manner of worship with which Aiakos and the Aiakidai were honoured on Aegina may have been grander than that normally accorded to heroes. Pausanias' description of the Aiakeion suggests that it was an unusually elaborate edifice for a *ἡρώων*.¹⁰ And the idea that the statues of Aiakos and the Aiakidai were capable of being moved finds a resonance in Herodotus' account of how Aiakos and the Aiakidai were twice summoned for help in battle by Greek armies.¹¹

What mythological event concerning Aiakos is likely to have been commemorated in such a song? Perhaps the story of how when their territories were afflicted by a drought (due to the murder either of Androgeos son of Minos by the Athenians, or of Stymphalos by Pelops) the champions of Greece, on the advice of Delphi, petitioned Aiakos to prevail upon his father Zeus to bring rain. The moment when Aiakos received the supplication of the Greek leaders was so central in Aeginetan traditions that it was this scene that

⁸ *θεοξένια* in general: pp. 310–11. Other theoxenic songs: Pind. D6; Bacch. fr. 21; Philod. *παϊάν*; and Pind., *Ol.* 3, which probably served the dual function of celebrating the return of a victor and celebrating a *θεοξένια*. Cf. Krummen (1990), 219 ff. (*contra* Shelmerdine (1987)). Theoxenic poetry is also mentioned in Plato, *Lysis*, 205 c.

⁹ The source is *ΣNem.* 7. 86 (Dr iii. 134. 15–16) *ἀπέστρεψε δὲ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα, ὡς τοῦ Αἰακοῦ ὑποδεγεμένου καὶ ἐξενικότος* ('he has directed the speech towards Heracles, since Aiakos received him and entertained him'). Compare *ΣNem.* 4. 22 (Dr iii. 69. 22 ff.), with Deneken (1881), 26; and the myth of Heracles' reception by Telamon in Pind. *Isth.* 6, which Σ says is derived from Hesiod's *Eoiai* (Dr iii. 255. 19–20; fr. 250 MW).

¹⁰ Paus. 2. 29. 6 *περίβολος τετράγωνος λευκοῦ λίθου* ('a square wall of white stone'). Pausanias also records the presence of an altar there, which was supposed to be a memorial to Aiakos.

¹¹ Her. 5. 80–1; 8. 64, 83.

was represented on a frieze above the entrance of the Aiakeion. It is easy to see that this event could have been commemorated every year in Aegina.¹²

We can speculate about the direction of the procession. The Aiakeion was probably a focus, providing the starting-point or the terminus, and perhaps even both, if the cult statue was first taken from the shrine and then brought back. What might the other focal points have been? The most prominent cult site—in antiquity as now—was the temple of Aphaea in the east of the island, but this had no direct connection with the myth of Aiakos and the drought.¹³ An important centre for the cult of Zeus in Aegina was near the summit of Mount Panhellenios, where he was worshipped under the title of Zeus Hellanios. The shrine there was said to have been set up by Aiakos in gratitude for the cessation of the drought.¹⁴ In view of the mythological associations, this would have been a natural place to bring the statue of Aiakos. He would have symbolically renewed his relationship with Zeus and guaranteed the prosperity of the island. And it is encouraging that Zeus seems to be described in lines 5–6 of the song as welcoming the procession. The procession would presumably have started from the Aiakeion, processed the five miles or so south and then east to the summit of Mount Panhellenios, and then returned to the Aiakeion.

Another possibility is that Aiakos was represented as returning to the Aiakeion from somewhere else. Pindar knew the myth that Aiakos returned from Troy in Poseidon's chariot (*Ol.* 8. 48 ff.):

Ὀροστρίαινα δ' ἐπ' Ἴσθμῳ ποντιᾷ
 ἄρμα θοὸν τάννεν,
 50 ἀποπέμπων Αἰακὸν
 δεῦρ' ἄν' ἵπποις χρυσέαις
 καὶ Κορίνθου δειράδ' ἐποψόμενος δαιτικλυτάν.

(The trident-raiser steered his swift chariot to the Isthmus by the sea, conveying Aiakos hither on golden horses, and intending to visit the ridge of Corinth, famous for feasts.)

There must be a chance that a ritual at the Aiakeia commemorated this event (the parallel with the Cyrenaean ritual of the recep-

¹² The myth: pp. 331–2. The iconography: J. Toepffer, *RE* s.v. *Aiakeion* i. 921–2; Paus. 2. 29. 6; Pind. *Nem.* 5. 53 *προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ* ('the porch of Aiakos'). There was also one in Athens: Her. 5. 89; Hesych. s.v. *Αἰάκειον*, i. 59 Latte; Stroud (1994). Does Pindar perhaps reflect this visual imagery in *Nem.* 8. 13 *ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ σεμνῶν γονάτων* ('A suppliant of the dignified knees of Aiakos')?

¹³ See above, n. 2.

¹⁴ See p. 331–2; Paus. 2. 30. 4.

tion of the Antenoridai would then be almost exact). Alternatively, Aiakos might have been represented returning to the underworld: according to later mythographic sources, he became one of the three judges in the underworld after his death, and there is reason to believe that this myth is both at least as early as the fifth century BC and Aeginetan.¹⁵ One might pay special attention to *Isth.* 8. 23–4, according to which Aiakos acted as a divine arbitrator: *ὁ καὶ | δαιμόνεσσι δίκας ἐπείραινε* ('who also brought to a conclusion claims of justice for the gods'). What follows suggests that Pindar was thinking of the dispute between Zeus and Poseidon for the hand of Thetis. Aiakos' reputation as an honest judge is independently illustrated by the tradition that the Athenian Aiakeion was a place where legal claims were registered.¹⁶ Perhaps Aiakos was conceived of as spending alternate parts of the year in Aegina and in Hades. His arrival will have been celebrated in the Aiakeia with games and a *θεοξένια*, which Zeus, as his father, will have been represented as attending, perhaps coming from his outpost on Mount Panhellenios. To speculate on the movement of the procession, I would guess that a statue of Aiakos was first taken to some point outside the city, and then brought back to the Aiakeion to the accompaniment of music and song (perhaps *ἐπιχώριοι ὕμνοι* of the sort that Pausanias mentions in his account of a Sicyonian ritual that involved the carrying of a statue of Dionysus).¹⁷ Our information about Aeginetan sacred geography is insufficient to allow us to pin down the point outside the city from which the return procession would have started. One possibility would be the shrine of Zeus Panhellenios on Mount Hellanicus; another would be the temple of Aphaea five miles east of the main town (compare Pindar's cult song in honour of Aphaea); a third starting-point would perhaps be the mysterious Asopian Fountain (*Ἀσωπὶς κρήνη*), which according to a late lexicographical source was the venue for the *ἀμφορίτης ἀγών*, which we have independent grounds for believing was part

¹⁵ Aiakos in the underworld: see Isocr. *Ev.* 15; Plato, *Ap.* 41 A; *Gorg.* 524 A; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3. 12. 6. In MSS at Ar. *Frogs*, 464; also Euripides/Critias, *Peirithoos* = TrGF i. 43, fr. 1 (lines 6 ff. = Eur. TGF 591).

¹⁶ Stroud (1994), referring to POxy 2087. Support might be sought in D6. 155–6; another tradition (of unknown provenance) relating to the arbitration of Aiakos is preserved by Paus. 1. 39. 6: he served as an arbiter in a dispute between Sciron and Nisus son of Pandion. Contrast Thomas Hubbard's hypothesis (1987a) that the motif of Aiakos as divine arbitrator along with the closely associated topic of the prophecy of Themis is a Pindaric innovation.

¹⁷ Paus. 2. 7. 5.

of the Aiakeia.¹⁸ The sequence would perhaps have been: procession out, race, procession back, perhaps with the winner of the race leading the procession.¹⁹

The contiguity of S3 and S4 in the papyrus shows that these fragments are from songs that Hellenistic editors placed in the same genre (unless the papyrus was an anthology), but the genre remains uncertain. SnMae class them as a *Paianes*, basing this on the fact that Π⁷ contributes to them. However, the hypothesis that S3–4 are from *Paianes* is difficult to reconcile with the absence in them of any reference to Apollo. One would also expect a *παιάν* refrain at the end of the first song, and although we cannot rule out the possibility that line S3. 40 ended with a short refrain of the form *ἰῆ ἰῆ*, the chances are against it. The form of the title of S4 might be expected to shed light on the question: there is no parallel for it among the *Paianes*, but we cannot assign it to any other specific genre either. One thing we can be reasonably sure of is that it is not the title of a *Dithurambos*, because these seem generally to have consisted of specified mythological subject-matter.

The available genres are *Prosodia*, *Huporkhemata*, or even *Parthenia* (since the third book of the latter—the *κεχωρισμένα παρθένεια*—seems to have contained a miscellany).²⁰ In the end, we have insufficient evidence to decide between these alternatives, but I incline in favour of *Prosodia* on the grounds of the movement implied in the first two lines of S4. If the celebration involved the representation of a hero being drawn by horses, it would not be surprising if the *χορός* moved along as well, whether or not they employed the route I suggested above. For all we know, that might have been enough for Hellenistic editors to class the song as a *Prosodion*, but it is also possible that there were further clues specifying mode of performance later on in the song.

The fact that both songs relate to heroes may have a consequence for our knowledge of the Hellenistic classification of Pindar's songs and of the *Prosodia* in particular. It suggests that there was a subsection of the genre devoted to heroes, there being at least one other subsection covering gods. Since there were two books of *Prosodia*,²¹

¹⁸ See above, n. 1.

¹⁹ One might compare the Athenian Oschophoria, which had the elements procession and race, though in reverse order: the procession (to the temple of Athena Sciras at Phaleron) preceded the race. See Rutherford and Irvine (1988).

²⁰ See Lehnus (1980), 79 ff.

²¹ See the list of genres at §14 n. 18.

the likeliest scenario would be that the first consisted of songs devoted to gods and the second of songs devoted to heroes.

S5 (*Pa. XIII*)

(a)

| | | | |
|-------|---|------------------------------|--|
| str.? | ἥρωϊ τε βω[μὸν
τω τανδε[
δωκεν· οἱ[
πόντοιο [
5 Παλλάδα [
.]έπτοι τ[.]ωσαι λεῖπ[
σὺν παντ[.]ωτερον α[
ῦμνων ἐρ[.]χορίαις
9 ἄλλο[ν]τι [.]τω πρὸς
— πολυηρατο[.]εκα[
ant.? | | |
| | νῦν . . . ἀνθ[
νυμφᾶν συ[
θυιαίγιδ' αμ[χορόν
ἰστάμεναι τέλ[
15 δων τανυᾶ[.] σὺν κτύπῳ [()]υ- ἀν-
δησάμεναι πλ[ο]κάμους
μύρτων ὑπ[.] σφιν ἔγειρον [
αἰθέρι', ἐλικ[.] δὲ πορφυ-
ρέα σὺν κρόκ[α.]τινάειπρ[
20 εὐά(μ)πυκι ἐν [.]μῳ σελα[
ἐν δαιτί τε πα[.]ει μακαρ[
ἐνθεν μὲν ἀρ[.]ατων Ὀλυμπ
ταν πολέμου[.]ν
σαμάντορι [
25 ἐν χρ[| 3
12
15
3
6
9 | |

[(b) 1 and (c) 1 may align with (a) 6: see commentary]

(b)

]s ἐχθρῶν ὁμιλήσειε[.]α

(c)

]ιν τοία τις ἐμ[---

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| |]ρατου πάτρας ἐκάς |]σαι σταθεῖσαι[|
| |] . ἐρας[] |]ν |
| | χ]εῖρας ἀραιὰς |] . αῖς ὀλολυγαῖς [|
| 5 | φ]έρτατος ἀνθρώπων φ. [~ - |] . ἔμαθον δ' ὅτι μοῖραν [- ~ |
| | ο]ύκ αἰσχροὺς πάθοις |]λλα ἐπλα[. .] .] παθα[|
| |]σις ἀνανύτοις εὖρεν |]ς ἔδραι θε[. . . .]ιον |
| |]ιαν αἶσαν· |]εσχοντολ[. . .] . |
| |] . |] . ει καὶ νῦν τέρας δι[|
| 10 |] . θ . πορήσαν[.] |]γον οὐτ' οὖν ἀμπελ[|
| |]θ[.] φ[. .] ν προκρίνοι |] . ατων οὐδ' Ἀχελαιο[|
| |]ση καλεῖν |] . |
| |]ει τις ἄτερθεν[|]ινᾶν μνάμ' ἔτι του[|
| |]κας[. . .] |]οντεσσι πιθεσ[~ 7]αι |
| 15 |] . . δε θυμῷ |]εδ' ἀμφ[|
| |]ενει κατεβα[|]εσποτ[|
| |] . |]ιτεμ[|
| |] . |]ω να . [|
| |]ων ὁπότε |] . [|
| 20 |]ύοντές νιν ἐκ | |
| |] . | |
| |]χαν νέμειν | (g) |
| |] . | |
| |]σαν |]σιωνε[|
| 25 |]ων κύριοι |]τ' Ἀχιλλῆα [|
| |] . . |]ν ἔστιν[|

Π* (regular, upright capitals, in columns of 25 lines, with few scholia but numerous corrections); Π' fr. 6 = (a) 8–10; SnMae omit the small fragments (f), (h), (i); I omit (d), (e), and (k) as well

(a) 4 μέδοντα καὶ Zuntz (1935) 6]Ἐ ἐ-ρ[]έπτοι Sn 8]Γ, Τ, Π ἐρατῶν
 ἐν εὐαγορίαις Zuntz (1935) 9 θάλλο[ν]τι Zuntz (1935) 11 NYN Π': NYM
 Π* 12–13 βεβρι-|θου' αἰγιδ' Zuntz (1935) 13 Lobel ap. SnMae: θυιοαιγιδ
 Π^{ac}, corrected by two different hands to εὐι- (D' Alessio (1999)) and -υιαγ- χορόν
 Zuntz (1935) 14–15 τέλ[εσαν πο-|]δῶν Sn; χορ-|]δῶν Zuntz (1935); τελ[ετάν
 Ferrari (1991a) 15 Ἀ[Ε]Π[]; ταυναχέι Zuntz (1935) 16 ΔΗΣΑΜ Π^{ac}: ΔΗΣΕΜ
 Π^{ac} suppl. Sn 17 Π[or Τ[ὕπ[ο κα[Sn ΣΦΙΝ Π^{ac}: ΣΠΙΝ Π^{ac}; θε[πιν Ferrari
 (1991a); [φθέγματα Sn 18 There is a mark above the last letter of ΑΙΘΕΡΙ, perhaps
 an apostrophe (Sn) or a superscribed Α αἰθέρι ἐλίκ[εσσι Zuntz (1935) 19 ΤΙΝ
 or ΠΙΜ ΑΕΙ or ΔΕΙ 20 ΕΥΑΝΠΥΚΙΑΝ[Π^{ac}: ΕΥΑΝΠΕΚΙΕΝ[Π^{ac}; εὐανπυκ'ιεν Sn; 'an
 Baccheum εὐάν intellegendum?' Turyn 22 Ε[, Π[, Μ[25 ΕΝ or Ε[Ι]Ν

(b) 1 EKX OMEIAHΣEIE 2 εὐ]ηράτου Zuntz (1935); πολυ]ηράτου Lloyd-Jones
 3]Α, Α, Χ, Κ ΕΡ fr. 294 Ἀλέρας υἱόν (i.e. Tityus) positioned here by Turyn
 4 suppl. Bowra (1935); Μ]οίρας ἀραιάς Zuntz (1935) ΑΡΑΙΑC 5 φύ]σαν Zuntz
 (1935) 6 Κ' Π 8 e.g. δαλβ]ίαν αἶσαν Rutherford 10 ΡΗC εἰ]ὺθυπο-
 ρήσαν-|τ... Bowra (1935), Zuntz (1935) 11 ΠΡΟΚΡΕΙΝΟΙ Π* 15 ἐκόν]τ;
 Zuntz (1935) 16 Α[or Α[εὐμ]ενεῖ κατέβα[ν νοῶ e.g. Rutherford

(c) 2 Α[or ΑΙ· 3]Ν or]ΑΙ 4 perhaps]ΥΑΙC (ruling out διαπρυσ]αῖς—
 cf. *HH* 5. 19) 5]Ε? 6 ΑΛΙ ΑΙΠΑΕ[Π^{ac}; ΕΠΑΑ[Π^{ac}]π' ἀθα[νατ Sn
 8 Α[, Δ[]Υ,]Ρ 9]Α,]Δ,]Α,]Χ,]Κ apparently ΤΕΡΑC 10 i.e. οὐτ'
 ὦν Lobel ap. SnMae; Σεμέλης]γόνου τοῦν ἀμπελ[ω δυνάτου Zuntz (1935) Α[, Α[
 14]ΟΝΤΕC[]C] ΑΜΦ[...]]Γ[Π; οντεσι πίθεσ[θε D'Alessio (1999), from Σ above line;
 γαρυ]οντες ὅτι θεσπ[εσί]q Erbse ap. SnMae 17]ΙΤ or]Ι

(g) 3]ΝΕC,]ΑΙΟC,]ΑΙΘΕ

Σ (c) 14 (above line) σιπιθεσ[...]α;

-σι πίθεσ[θε ~5]α; D'Alessio (1999); ὅτι θεσπ[εσί]q Erbse

(a) . . . for the hero an altar . . . gave . . . of the sea . . . Pallas . . . of
 songs . . . (10) much-prayed for . . . now . . . of brides . . . in a χορός with
 rushing aegis . . . setting . . . with a delicate sound . . . binding their hair
 with myrtle . . . they aroused . . . heavenly . . . with red wool . . . (20) with
 a good frontlet . . . gleam . . . in a feast . . . blessed . . . from where . . .
 Olympus (?) . . . of war . . . signer . . . (b) . . . enemies . . . would have
 intercourse with . . . far from homeland . . . slender hands . . . strongest
 of men . . . you would not suffer a shameful thing . . . unaccomplished he
 found . . . destiny . . . (11) . . . prefer . . . call . . . someone without . . . in
 heart . . . went down . . . when . . . (20) . . . him from . . . to distribute . . .
 in control. (c) . . . such a woman . . . standing . . . cries of *ololuge* . . . they
 learnt that fate . . . seats . . . they had . . . marvel . . . (10) . . . vine . . . not
 of Acheloos . . . memorial . . . (g) . . . Achilles . . . is . . .

An overlap with Π⁷ shows that *PBerol* 13411 (Π*) contained songs
 of Pindar.¹ Metrical considerations suggest that (a), (b), and (c)
 might be from the same song: (a) is in dactylo-epitrite, and al-
 though certain metrical analysis of (b) is impossible, nothing about
 it precludes analysis as dactylo-epitrite;² the same is true of (c).
 Snell used what can be established about the metre as a specula-
 tive basis for reconstructing the order of the fragments: he argued
 that (a) 1–5 correspond to (a) 21–5, which suggests that the stro-
 phe had 20 lines and that (a) comprises the end of a strophe and
 the beginning of an antistrophe (in that case the παράγραφος after

¹ Thanks to the kindness of Frau Dr Müller I was able to inspect the papyrus in
 the Pergamum Museum in Aug. 1991.

² (b) 7 is prima facie an exception to dactylo-epitrite; for possible explanations see
 Snell (1940), 189.

line 10 represents the beginning of the antistrophe); furthermore, he showed that if (*b*) and (*a*) are from adjacent columns, the order (*a*)(*b*) seems to work better than (*b*)(*a*), since (*b*) 1–5 match the ends of (*a*) 6–10.³

What we can establish about the content of the fragments is this: (*a*) begins with something about an altar to a hero, then goes on to mention Athena (line 5), ὕμνοι (line 8), females who dance in an aegis-shaking χορός (line 13),⁴ bind their hair with myrtle (15–16), raise cries, and wear red wool in some way (18–19). The adjective θυιαίγιδ' (line 13) suggests the sphere of Dionysus.⁵ (*a*) concludes with mention of a banquet, possibly a banquet of the gods (line 21). The more intelligible part of fragment (*b*) has something about someone consorting with enemies 'far from the delightful native land' (lines 1–2) and advice to someone: 'you would suffer nothing disgraceful' (line 6). (*c*) has more about women celebrating (δόλυνγαις in line 4), followed by a reference to someone (the singer? women?) learning something (line 5), then a possible reference to an omen (line 9), a vine (line 10) and Acheloos (i.e. water: line 11).⁶ The scrap (*g*) is of interest because it includes the name Achilles, but unfortunately it is so small that we can form no idea of the metre, so we cannot even be sure that it comes from the same song as (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*).

On the basis of these data it is impossible to determine the subject

³ Snell also tried to show that (*b*) 1–5 correspond to (*b*) 20–4. However, there are problems. (1) First, it would give a stanza of 19 lines, so either a line has been omitted or the colometry is irregular. The latter alternative might seem to be indicated by a second factor (2), the fact that (*b*) 11 is long while (*a*) 16 (which ought to correspond to it) is short. Thirdly (3), this would require that the structure of the song was monostrophic, which is much less likely than a triadic structure, even for a comparatively unelaborate cult song. In view of these problems, it is tempting to conclude that the parallel between (*b*) 1–5 (antistrophe) and (*b*) 20–4 (epode) is coincidental—hardly surprising, one might think, in a comparatively regular metre like dactylo-epitrite. Snell also points out that (*c*) 1–5 seem to have much the same pattern (two long lines, followed by a short line, followed by two long lines) as (*a*) 6–10, (*b*) 1–5, and (*b*) 20–5. It seems all too easy to find such patterns. But in that case little seems to stand in the way of the crucial parallel between (*a*) 6–10 and (*b*) 1–5 being a coincidence as well.

⁴ In view of the reference to dancing in the lines following the adjective, θυιαίγιδ' seems less likely to be the epithet of a deity than an adjective describing a χορός.

⁵ The element θυι- (only here as the first element of a compound) suggests the Dionysiac Thyiades at Delphi, the festival of Dionysus called the Thuaia in Elis (Paus. 6. 26. 1), and θυ(ι)άς in the sense of 'inspired woman', as at *PMG* 778(*b*); Aesch. *Sept.* 498, 836; *Su.* 364. The reading ἐϋαίγιδ', which seems to be implied by a correction in the papyrus (D'Alessio (1999)), would be equally Dionysiac.

⁶ Cf. *Sz.* 9; p. 404.

of the song (assuming the fragments come from only one song). To Zuntz (1935) the presence of the gods at the celebration in (a) 11 ff. suggested one of two illustrious weddings—that of Cadmus and Harmonia or that of Peleus and Thetis; and the mention of Achilles in (g) swung him in favour of the latter (he does not consider the possibility that (g) could come from a different song). The earlier part of the song—(c), (b), and the first part of (a)—he suggested might have dealt with the myth of Melampus and the Proetides: (c) 10 made him think of Dionysus,⁷ and he supposed Melampus to be the hero in (a) 1 and the speaker of the sentiments about a native land in (b) 2 (cf. D4. 28 ff.). He suggested that the context might have been the Argive Agrionia. Needless to say, this position is highly speculative.⁸

Snell also made a suggestion about the content of the song. He agreed with Zuntz that (a) 11 ff. suggests a wedding, but he favoured the wedding of Niobe and Tantalus, citing F9. No detail in the text supports this, nor is it obvious what Athena would have been doing at Niobe's wedding.

On present evidence, we can tell nothing about the theme or context of the song.⁹ There is no special reason to suppose that it was a *Paian*: there is no sign of a refrain, nor any reference to Apollo or Artemis.

S6 (*Pa.* XVII (a), (b))

(a)

].θενι.[
]γνυ[
]μόν' Ὀλυμ[π
].τον οὐ ῥητ[ὸ]ν[
 5]υγίαις φντενο[
 οὐ]ρανομάκα[

⁷ The supplement he suggested was Σεμέλης] γόνου τοῦν ἀμπέλ[ω, which seems awkward and inferior to Lobel's solution (see apparatus).

⁸ Snell used metrical arguments as ammunition against Zuntz's position, which required that fragment (c) (Melampus and the Proetides) should precede fragment (a) (conclusion of Melampus and the Proetides, marriage of Peleus and Thetis).

⁹ For the hypothesis that it might be an *Oscho-phoricon* see Rutherford and Irvine (1988).

]ν τοῦτο βαλλεῖμ[
]ὰν βαθύ[.]λ[
]συ[

(b)

| | | | |
|---|----|-----|-----------------|
| | -6 | ~11 |]εω[|
| | -5 | ~11 |]ωιγ[|
| | -4 | ~11 |]ν ἀέρι[|
| | -3 | ~11 |]· τῆ παιηόνων[|
| [| -2 | ~11 |]φοριᾶν πεταλ[|
|] | -1 | ~6 |]ε[~3] |

(a) Π²⁶ fr. 6; (b) Π²⁶ fr. 7. 1-6

(a) 1 πα]ρθενια[or -νικ[Sn 2]νυ[[ν]] [3 ΜΟΝ ἀγε]μόν' Ὀλύμ[πιον Lobel
 4 Lobel 5 (δι)ω]λυγίαις sc. ἀοιδαῖς Lobel; ὠγ]υγίαις Rutherford 6 Μᾶ
 suppl. Lobel 7 perhaps ΕΜ[i.e. βαλλέμ[εν Lobel 8 perhaps βαθύ[κο]λπ[ο
 Lobel

(b) -6 perhaps È -4 ἈΕΡ -3]ΑΤ, ΕΓ? Ὁ -2 νικα] Lobel; καὶ δαφνα]
 Sn; ὠσχο] Rutherford ἌΝ

(a) . . . Olympian . . . unspeakable . . . plant . . . the length of heaven . . .

(b) . . . in the air . . . of παιᾶνες . . . petals of the carrying of . . .

Π²⁶ fr. 6 contains nine lines from the top of a column; Π²⁶ fr. 7 comprises the last six lines of one song and the first eleven of another from the bottom of a column. It has been concluded on the basis of the appearance of the papyrus that both are from the same column, in which case both (a) and (b) will be from the same song.¹ Little can be said about it: Lobel thought that (a) might contain a reference to poetry, suggesting the supplement διω]λυγίαις ('enormous'), with a word like ἀοιδαῖς understood. However, that adjective is not attested until Plato,² and the chances must be in favour of the Pindaric ὠ]γγυγίαις, perhaps referring to a place, such as Θήβαις.³ In view of

¹ Snell estimated 12 lines between the two fragments, assuming 39 lines in a column of Π²⁶ on the basis of a hypothesis about Π²⁶, fr. 14; but a column may have been a little longer: see p. 165 n. 5, p. 252 n. 33.

² *Laws* 890 E; for the use of the adjective of poetry there is no example before *Orphic Argonautica*, 408.

³ Pindar uses the adjective at *Nem.* 6. 44, conjectured also at fr. 44. 1; of Thebes at *Aesch. Pers.* 37; *Sept.* 975; *AG* 2. 382; *A.R.* 3. 1178, *Paus.* 9. 5. 1. Another possibility is *Φρυγίαις*.

this, οὐρανομάκεια is perhaps most likely to refer to some natural phenomenon, such as trees.⁴ In (b) a reference to poetry is unmistakable: ἀέρι[(-4) perhaps has to do with song touching the sky (cf. D7. 11; S5. 18). Lines -3/-2 perhaps had the structure παιηόνων | καὶ δαφνα]φοριᾶν (νικα]φοριᾶν, ὠσχο]φοριᾶν) πέταλ[α.⁵ The meaning of παιηόνων[is probably 'παιάν-cries' rather than 'παιάν-songs'.⁶ It would be a mistake to infer that S6 is from a song classed as a *Paian*, because we know from the example of Bacch. 17 that songs which contained what seem to us paeanic generic signatures were not always classed as *Paianes* in ancient editions.⁷ To clarify our ideas about the genre we must move on to S7.

S7 (*Pa.* XVIII)

| | | |
|--------|-------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Α]ργείοις...[.]ς Ἡλεκτρῶ[ν < 30] |
| str. A | [* | έν Τυν]δαριδᾶν ἱερῶ |
| | | τεμέ]νει πεφυτευμένον ἄ[λσος |
| | | ἀνδ]ρὶ σοφῶ παρέχει μέλος[|
| | ~4] | ν' ἀμφὶ πόλιν φλεγε[|
| 5 | ~4] | ν ὕμνων σέλας ἐξ ἀκαμαν[το-... |
| | ~5] | ι[.]' μένος οὐ κεν ἐς ἀπλακ[|
| | ~7] | περὶ [Δ]αρδανία |
| | ~12] | ι οἶά ποτε Θήβα |
| | ~12] | τε καὶ ἀν[ι]κα ναύλοχοι |
| 10 | ~11] | ήλασαν [ἐ]ννύχιον κρυφα[|
| | ~12] | λεκ.[< 6]...[.] |

Π²⁶ fr. 7. 7-18

TITLE ΟΙC Π^{PC} ΟΥC Π^{SC} ΕΙΞ[ΤΑ]Σ ΗΑΕΚΤΡΥΩ[ΝΟC ΘΥCΙΑC or ΕΟΡΤΑC Lobel, Sn; e.g. ΑΣ[ΠΙ]Σ ΗΑΕΚΤΡΥΩ[ΝΟC Rutherford 1 έν Sn Τυν] Lobel ΔΑΝΙ 2-3 Lobel 4 Ν' εὐφρ]ον' Rutherford ΠΟΛ 5 ΑΝ (sublinear hyphen implying a compound adjective: §13 n. 10) 6 ΟΥ ἀ(μ)πλακ[Johansen and Whittle (1980) 7 ΙΑΙ suppl. e.g. Lobel 8 perhaps]'ΩΙ 'ΟΙΔΑ ΘΗΒΑΙ 9 'ΑΝ[suppl. Lobel ΑΥ 10]ΗΛ Τηλεβόαι ἀπ]ήλασαν Sn (cf. Pavese (1993), 154; sc. βόας?) ΧΟΝ

⁴ It refers to trees at Hom. *Od.* 5. 239; Her. 2. 131.

⁵ I would compare μέτρα παιηό-|νων at D6. 121-2; παιηόνων ἄνθεα ('flowers of παιάνες') at Bacch. 15. 9; also]αφοριᾶν [at D12.

⁶ See pp. 21-2.

⁷ On this song see p. 98.

Π^{ac} 11 ἐσβάντες Ἡ]λεκτ[ρύωνος] κτ[ήματα/κτ[έατα Sn; Ἡ]λεκτρύων(ος) Lobel;
]ΚΤ[?

For the Argives . . . Electryon . . . The grove planted in the sacred precinct of the Tyndaridai offers for a wise man song . . . around the city blazes . . . the flash of hymns from untiring (mouths?) . . . [I would not fall into] error [if I were to tell how heroes died] around the Dardanian city [or what happened] once at Thebes . . . and when ship-lurking men . . . drove in secret a nightly . . .

We assume from the title that the song was performed by Argives, and that it had something to do with Electryon.¹ It begins with a reference to 'the sacred precinct of the Tyndaridai', perhaps one in Argos, since *Nem.* 10. 49 shows that the Tyndaridai were honoured in a *θεοξένια* at Argos.² Perhaps Electryon had his *ἥρῳον* there, or there may have been a sacred grove in the precinct that Electryon was supposed to have founded.³ The city may also have been specified at the beginning of line 4, but no supplement suggests itself. It is attractive to speculate that this precinct was the place where the song was first performed, but it is not possible to be sure.

The start of the song is concerned with poetry. The thought of the opening sentence, that the sacred grove in the precinct of the Tyndaridai offers song to the wise man (the poet), suggests that the song will explain the origin of the grove or the precinct rather than that the grove is inspiring the poet; Lobel compares *Nem.* 6. 32–3 *Πιερίδων ἀρόταις δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολλὸν ὕμνον* ('capable of providing much song for the ploughmen of the Pierides'), where it is victors in the games who by their achievements provide a theme for song. There is a parallel for a song giving an account of the origin of a grove in *Olympian* 3.⁴ A minor problem is raised by line 5: the most obvious interpretation of *ἀκαμαν[το-* is that the flash of the *ὕμνοι* comes from untiring mouths.⁵ But to imply that the performers are untiring is unparalleled and extraordinary. The usual idea is that the poet/*χορός* are not untiring and need divine assistance (as in D6.

¹ Electryon rather than Electryone (1) because he is at least in the right area, having connections with Mycenae and Tiryns, and also (2) because the assumption that it is Electryon allows us to make some sense of lines 8–9.

² See Deneken (1881), 14.

³ A recently published Hellenistic inscription from Argos attests a cult of Electryon: see Kritzas (1992), 237–9; D'Alessio (1997), 42, to whom I am indebted for this reference.

⁴ Note that *Ol.* 3 also opens with a reference to the Tyndaridai.

⁵ So Lobel (1961), 37.

51 ff.), but there is no sign that divine assistance was mentioned here. Are these perhaps divine mouths?

Lines 6 ff. probably represent a priamel-type introduction to a myth with a sense something like '[I would not fall into] error [if I were to tell how heroes died] around the Dardanian city . . . or the following (which is the subject of the song)'. The device of introducing the subject of a song via a foil is common in Pindar.⁶ Then there is a reference to Thebes, and something about people lurking in a ship (*ναύλοχοι*).⁷ The most celebrated episode connected with Electryon was the story of how Taphian and Teleboan pirates raided Mycenae, killed all but one of his sons, and made off with his cattle.⁸ The pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis* tells how Amphitryon—who had been exiled from Mycenae for inadvertently causing Electryon's death—later headed a revenge raid on the Taphian islands.⁹ The *ναύλοχοι* are probably the Taphians, then, and *ἦλασαν* (line 10) suggests that the earlier cattle raid of the Taphians and Teleboans on Mycenae was related here, perhaps by way of introduction to the story of Amphitryon's revenge raid (that would account for the relevance to Thebes).

There is a chance that the song might have gone on to narrate the birth of Heracles, since there was a link between the conception of Heracles and the attack on the Taphians: Alcmena refused to allow her marriage to be consummated until Amphitryon had punished the latter.¹⁰ In that case one might wonder whether the description of the birth of Heracles in S1 could have come from later on in the same song, since Heracles was related to Electryon and episodes relating to different generations of the same family might well have figured in the same song.¹¹

The genre is uncertain. The content suggests one of the *εἰς θεούς* genres (not the *Humnoi*, from which one would expect heroes to

⁶ *Ol.* 13. 52 ff.; *Isth.* 1. 1 ff., with Bundy (1962), 36 ff.; fr. 169a. 6 ff., with Pavese (1967).

⁷ Lobel (1961), 37, points out that *ναύλοχος* is otherwise used only of places where ships can ride, not of persons lurking in ships (or lying in wait for ships: cf. *ὀρνιχολόχος* at *Isth.* 1. 48), though the verb *ναυλοχεῖν* is used both of persons and of ships lying in wait.

⁸ Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 4. 5 ff.; A.R. 1. 747–51 (an episode on the shield of Jason); Strabo, 7. 7. 2; 10. 2. 14.

⁹ *Aspis*, 19 ff.; see also Her. 5. 59; *Nem.* 10. 15; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2. 4. 8.

¹⁰ Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F 13a, b = ΣHom. *Il.* 14. 323 (ii. 50. 19 ff., iv. 62. 13 ff. Dindorf) and *Od.* 12. 266 (ii. 495. 1 ff. Dindorf).

¹¹ The metre offers no corroboration, but S1 could well be from an epode.

be excluded). Titles are often illuminating in respect of genre, but in this case the title is unhelpful. The gap between Α]ΠΓΕΙΟΙΣ and ΗΛΕΚΤΡΥΩ[N is too large for ΕΙΣ (which one would expect on the analogy of other titles), and I am not impressed by stop-gap attempts to deal with the problem such as Α]ΠΓΕΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ [ΤΑ]Σ ΗΛΕΚΤΡΥΩ[ΝΟΣ ΘΥΣΙΑΣ or ΕΟΡΤΑΣ. It may be that this was a title specifying a theme, e.g. Α]ΠΓΕΙΟΙΣ ΑΣ[ΠΙ]Σ ΗΛΕΚΤΡΥΩ[ΝΟΣ]. We tend to associate titles of this type with *Dithuramboi*, but we cannot rule out the possibility that thematic titles might sometimes have been used in other genres.¹²

S8 (fr. 59)

~14] . . ενε . . [~4] . . [

~11] πάτερ·

(τ)ό]θι, ~?] . π' Ἑλλῶν . χρο[3

~11] ες ἑορτ[ά.] κατεβα[

5 ~11] ν γεδα[. .] (.) ν · [

ἀψευδέ[ς: ~4] . εν μαν[τ]ήϊον[6

ἐφέπετ[αι: ~3] πτυχὶ Τομάρου[

~12] σ ἀμετέρας ἀπ[ο

~6 φόρμι]γγι κοινω- 9

10 σ ~9] ν πολυώνυμον·

ἐνθεν μὲν[: τ]ριπόδεσσὶ τε

καὶ θυσίαις[: ~8]

Π²⁶ fr. 96A; fr. 95 contributes the start of lines 11–12; fr. 96B contributes scholia; fr. 41A was tentatively placed at the start of lines 6–7 by Lobel

1 EN or EM, ΕΓ[or ΕΠ[: perhaps = fr. 57. 1: Δωδωναίε μεγασθενές Sn; Δωδωναίε μεγα]σθενές[excluded by Lobel 3 (τ)ό]θι from Σ N·X, NIX, NOX 4 ἑορτ[ά.] Sn 'cum [A] breuius, [AN] vel etiam [AI] longius spatio vid.' κατέβαν or κατέβαμεν Sn 5]Α,]Δ,]Λ 6]Α,]Ζ; σόν, ὦ] Ζεύ Sn suppl. Lobel 7 Μ·Ρ 8 γὰ]ς, πόλις Sn; φωνᾶ]ς Rutherford; μῆτις] D'Alessio (1991) ΑΠ[9 Lobel 9–10 κοινω-] [σόμενον χορό]ν Sn 10 ὦ N· 11 Lobel

Σ 1–2 uncertain traces

3 []θι τόπου ὀριστ[ικ(όν) ἰν]α < 20?] (Lobel)

¹² For the thematic titles of *Dithuramboi* see p. 151.

5 δ. . ρ. ἔτεκε(εν)

9 Θεσσαλοῖ[< 20?]

11 ἀρχ() ἀπὸ Θηβ[ών < 20?]

Related is P²⁶ fr. 96B(a) "Ομηρ]ος Ζελλοί, Καλλιμά[χος | ἀμφότερ]α: "ἔδρα-
νον Ἑλλώ[ν" (so Lobel; Pfeiffer at fr. 675 restores Ἑλλώ[ν] καὶ "Σελλός"
ἐνὶ Τ]μαρίοις (fr. 23. 3) | [< 5] νμαντειαν ηπ[< 5] | [< 5] . σπρωτοιδί.
[< 5] (and (b)) [~?] . Πλευρ[~?] | [~?] π[Πλευρώνος (see n. 5)

3 Lobel 5 Perhaps δωρικὴν Lobel

. . . of Elloi . . . festival . . . came down . . . (6 ff.) oracle without deceit . . .
follows . . . the fold of Tomarus . . . from our (country? voice?) . . . share
with the lyre . . . with many names . . . whence with tripods and sacrifices . . .

(3) . . . determining place. (5) . . . gave birth . . . (9) Thessalian. (11) Beginning . . .
from Thebes. (fr. 96B(b)) Homer: Selloi; Callimachus both 'seat of the Elloi [Helloi
Pfeiffer]' and 'Sellos' among the Tmarioi . . . oracle; (b) . . . Pleuron

The indications are that this fragment relates to the oracle at Dodona. The form Ἑλλοί in line 3 was previously unknown, and it had been supposed that Pindar used the form with the rough breathing.¹ There are clear references to a festival (lines 4, 11–12); κατεβα[in line 4 could refer to the arrival of the singer (cf. D2. 34; D6. 13), and might therefore come from near the start of the song. In lines 9 ff. the χορός perhaps say that they will associate many-named Dodona with song.² The scholion Θεσσαλοῖ[on line 9 is mysterious, but presumably relates to some traditional link between Dodona and Thessaly, of which there are many: we hear that Dodona was founded by Pelasgians migrating from Thessaly and in particular that it was founded by a Thessalian named Hellos; that the Dodona referred to by Achilles in Hom. *Il.* 16 was in

¹ Strabo, 7. 7. 10 πότερον δὲ χρὴ λέγειν Ἑλλοῦς, ὡς Πίνδαρος, ἢ Σελλοῦς, ὡς ὑπονουοῦσι παρ' Ὀμήρῳ κείσθαι ('Should we say "Helloi", like Pindar, or "Selloi", as they think they find in Homer?'); ΣΑ on Hom. *Il.* 16. 234 (iv. 222. 6 Erbse; cf. 221. 1) Πίνδαρος χωρὶς τοῦ σ ἀπὸ Ἑλλοῦ τοῦ δρυτόμου, ᾧ φασὶ τὴν περιστῆραν πρώτην καταδείξει τὸ μαντεῖον ('Pindar writes it without the σ, deriving it from Hellos the wood-cutter, to whom they say the dove first showed the oracle'); Σ (a) in fr. 96b seems to have had the same force. Lobel (1961), 70, claims that the smooth breathing is found in ΣΑ on *Il.* 16. 234. I note that Steph. Byz. *Eth.* 268. 19 Meineke and Herodian 1. 299. 15 and 1. 506. 5 associate the term with the place-name Ἑλλοπία (with smooth breathing). For a general discussion see Parke (1967), 7.

² κοινά-|[σσομαι should perhaps be read in lines 9–10, as at *Nem.* 3. 12 (κοινάσσομαι is restored there on the analogy of κοινάσαντες at *Pyth.* 4. 115), and Bacch. 15. 49 πολυώνυμον (which SnMae want to refer to the χορός) could refer to a place, as at *Pyth.* 1. 17, or a deity, as at *HH Cer.* 18 (see Richardson (1974) ad loc.); *HH Ap.* 82; Bacch. *Epigr.* 1. 1 (*Nika*); Soph. *Ant.* 1115 (Dionysus); Ar. *Thesm.* 320 (Artemis); Pind. *Isth.* 5. 1; Call. *Hy.* 3. 7; Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus* (*CA* 227–8), 1 (see Pohlenz (1940), 117); Plato, *Phaedr.* 238 A.

Thessaly; and that the migrations of the Aenianes spanned Dodona and Thessaly.³ A scholion to line 12—ἀρχ() ἀπὸ Θηβ[—refers to Thebes (either Thebes in Boeotia or the Egyptian city might be meant); ἀμετέρας ἄπ[ο in line 8 could refer to the place, or it might refer to the voice of the singer. In any case we are reminded both of the report in F2 that Zeus sent two priestesses or doves from Egyptian Thebes, one to Dodona and the other to Libya, and also of the ancient tradition that tripods were sent from Boeotian Thebes to Dodona.⁴ Another fragment of a scholion from the same song perhaps indicates that Pindar used the rare form of the place-name Δωδών.⁵

No formal properties of the fragment suggest that it is from a παιάν. The first lines bear a resemblance to the opening lines of a hymn to Zeus at Dodona (fr. *57):

Δωδωναῖε μεγασθενές
ἀριστότεχνα πάτερ

(Dodonean father, of great strength, excellent in respect of art)

but, though attractive, the identification remains tentative. Some clues in the fragment would suit a *τριποδηφορικὸν μέλος* of the sort that Proclus records as accompanying the carrying of tripods from Thebes to Dodona, though it is uncertain whether any of these was composed by Pindar.⁶

³ Dodona was founded by Pelasgians migrating from Thessaly: ΣD on *Il.* 16. 234 (257 Erbse; cf. ii. 104. 7 ff. Dindorf). Dodona was founded by a Thessalian named Hellos: ΣT on *Il.* 16. 234 (iv. 221. 12 Erbse; Parke (1967), 36)—the Selloi were named after a certain Ἑλλοῦ τοῦ Θεσσαλοῦ. The Dodona referred to by Achilles in *Hom. Il.* 16. 234 was in Thessaly: Suidas of Thessaly, *FGrH* 602 F 11; Cineas of Thessaly, *FGrH* 603 F 2, interpreting *Il.* 2. 748 ff.; Strabo, 7, fr. 1; 9. 441; Parke (1967), 2, 16. The migrations of the Aenianes spanned Dodona and Thessaly: Strabo, 9. 5. 22; *Plut. Qu. Gr.* 293 F–294 A; 297 B 1 ff. Béquignon (1944), 148 ff., 154, argued that the story of the migration of the Aenianes via west Greece was invented to explain the existence of a cult of Neoptolemus in Aenis; see Woodbury (1979), 127 n. 143; also D6 n. 68.

⁴ We hear about tripods being sent from Thebes to Dodona in Ephorus ap. Strabo, 9. 2. 4 (*FGrH* 70 F 119); also Zenob. *Ep.* 2. 84; *CPG* i. 53. For the *τριποδηφορικὸν μέλος* that is supposed to have accompanied this ritual see pp. 354–5.

⁵ Fr. 96(b), cited in the apparatus. Apropos of (b), Lobel refers to ΣA' to *Hom. Il.* 16. 235 (ii. 105. 3 Dindorf) Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ φησιν ὁ Πλευρώνιος ἔθνος εἶναι τοὺς Ἑλλοὺς ἀπάγονον Τυρρηγῶν κτλ. ('Alexander of Pleuron says that the race of the Helloi is descended from the Etruscans'), but I would compare ΣSoph. *Tru.* 172 (p. 351 above), where a third-declension version of the name Δωδών is compared with the place-name Πλευρών, Πλευρώνιος; the same point made by Steph. Byz. 248. 13 Meineke; Herodian, ii. 643. 12; ii. 728. 17, 29; ii. 729. 6 Lentz.

⁶ See pp. 354–5 above.

S9 (*Pa.* XXII (*a-b*))

- (a)]
]καί νιν ὀρει[
 5]
]οτω τι
]
 * * *
- (b)] .ος ἴκοιθ' ἐδ[.]ν' ἐκα[
] .ειμοι τότε ποικίλον
]μον γλυκεῖ'
 ὕ]μεναίω
 5]ἀμφιθαλεῖ
] . βαμεν ἐξ' Ὀλύμπου·
]Κρόνιου Πέλοπος. αἰὼν γὰρ[
]εν οὐρανῶ
]ν πάρα· τόν ποτε
 10] .τό οἱ ἔτει θάνατο .[.].[
]οιεωτ[.]μηθέν .[
] .α .[]γα .[
] .[.]ε[] .[.]νποτε
]μασ[]
 15] .νειμ' ἐρανιστ[αῖς
 πρό]θυρον· ἐόν· πό[.]σεναμ[
]μ .νιε· .φα[
]ἀρμονία]

(a) = Π²⁶ fr. 55; (b) = Π²⁶ fr. 39

(b) 1]Λ,]Α ἴ Θ· ΕΚ εἶδ[νω]ν ἐκα[τι Sn 2]Λ,]Α τότε or τό τε Lobel
 3 Εἰ· 4 Lobel 5 Εἰ 6]Ν,]Ι? ΟΥ· 7 ΠΟΤ' Αἰ 9 ἈΡΑ· 10]ΥΤ,
]ΕΤ,]ΣΤ ΟΟ, Ο·Ο, or Φ+ΕΤ: perhaps πρ[ώτωι ἔτει Rutherford ΘΑ 11 Τ[Ι]Μ
 suits the space ΘΕ e.g. I[12]Π,]ΕΙ]ΑΙ[13 ΠΟΤΕ written in smaller
 letters 15]Ο]ἐνεμ' ἐρανιστ[αῖς Sn 16 suppl. Lobel *Ε Ν· Ο[
 Ε[ΑΜ[, ΔΑ[17 μάνιε Sn σφα[λ Sn 18 Σ (below the column)

Σ (a) 1]αν[

(b) 5 (i) ἀμφιθα]λεία δει[(ii) -φον, ὁ δ(ε) Δίδ(υμος) (?)

(b)7 (a) *Κρόνιο(ς) ὅτι ἀπὸ Διός, ἣ ὅτι ᾤκη(σεν) [τὸ Κρό]ιο(ν) ὄρος ἐν τῷ 'Ολύμπῳ.* (b) [...] "[ῥ]ος ἐν.] 'Ηλιακῶν, ἣ ὅτι Τάνταλο(ς) Πλου[τούς] υ[ἱ]δ]ς τῆς Κρ[ό]νου ὡς Ἀὐτ[ε]σιων (?)

(b)10 [...] perhaps Σ

(from below the column) [...] οἶεται πρὸς ἄρμ[...]].....γεν[|]...πι[...]]...γραφόμενον ἔχει...[]αρμονίαι πρότερον[|]...[]...δ[ι]...[]...ἐπ...[]...νέυρηται [

(b)5 (a) and (b) Lobel (b)7 (a) ἐν τῷ 'Ολύμπῳ Π: ἐν 'Ολυμπίᾳ Sn, comparing Σ*Ol.* 2. 13, Dr i. 65 21; 3. 22, Dr i. 117. 21 (b) Lobel (b)10 The meaning of the sign ~ is obscure (= ἐναι? see McNamee (1981), 29; (1992), 17)

(b) . . . he would reach . . . then spotted . . . sweet . . . wedding-song blooming on both sides . . . come from Olympus . . . of Cronian Pelops; for hearing . . . heaven . . . whom once . . . (10) to him in a year death . . . (15) distributed to those who took part in the feast . . . his porch . . . harmony.

(b5) Blooming on both sides . . . -phon, but Didymus. (b7) 'Cronian' because he is descended from Zeus, or because he occupied the Cronian hill of Olympus . . . as Istros says in bk. (?) of the *Eliaca* [cf. *FGrH* 334 F 40-2] or because Tantalus [*ΣOl.* 3. 23, Dr i. 117. 23] was the son of Plouto, daughter of Cronos, as Autesion says [cf. *FGrH* 298 F 1]. (b10) . . . thinks . . . being written . . . ἀρμονίαι previously . . . has been found . . .

In (b) 4-5 there is a reference to a marriage (ὑ]μεναίω . . .]ἀμφιθαλεῖ).¹ Marriage may also be referred to in (b) 1 (Snell supplements ἔδ[νω]γ ἔκα[τι, which could, however, refer to poetry: cf D4. 4). Pelops or Pisa was mentioned in line 7, so perhaps the marriage was that between Pelops and Hippodameia (Snell drew a comparison with *Ol.* 9. 10 ἐξάρατο κάλλιστον ἔδνον 'Ἰπποδαμείας' ('he won for himself the fairest wedding-gift of Hippodameia')). (b) 6 could refer to the gods' leaving Mount Olympus to come to the wedding, as they did for that of Peleus and Thetis, or Cadmus and Harmonia (note that Harmonia may have been mentioned in a scholion at the bottom of the column). τὸν ποτε in line 9 probably introduces a reference to another myth, earlier than the first.² If (b) 1-9 refers to the wedding of Pelops and Hippodameia, the second myth might have to do with the banquet at which Tantalus served up Pelops to the gods or Pelops' abduction by Poseidon—the myth that Pindar substitutes for the first in *Olympian* 1. It is difficult to make the

¹ ἀμφιθαλής: Oepke (1934); Robert (1940); also pp. 201-2 apropos of the Delphic Septerion. ἀμφιθαλής and marriage: Ar. *Birds*, 1737; Call. fr. 75. 3; Plut. *Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι παροιμιῶν*, 16. 3 (=CPG i. 324)

² I would compare such passages as *Ol.* 3. 13; *Ol.* 6. 17; *Ol.* 7. 33; *Ol.* 9. 9; *Ol.* 10. 104; *Pyth.* 1. 16; *Pyth.* 8. 39; *Pyth.* 9. 5; *Pyth.* 9. 15; *Nem.* 4. 25.

scanty fragments of (b) 10–17 fit either myth. At (b) 16]νεῖμ' ἐρανιστ[αῖς might refer to the banquet of Tantalus.³ An objection to this interpretation is posed by line 10, which seems to involve something happening in a year (ἔτει) and death. I cannot see what this would have to do with the banquet of Tantalus; nor with the myth of the abduction of Pelops. There are no clues about the genre. More recently, D'Alessio has suggested that the wedding could be that of Tantalus (father of Pelops) and Niobe: hence there could be a connection between S9 and F9.⁴

³ The banquet is described as an ἔρπνος at *Ol.* 1. 38; so Epicharmus, *CGF* fr. 87, 1 (*Λόγος καὶ Λογία*). For the ἐρανιστής see Poland (1909), 28 ff.; Ziebarth (1896), 15 ff.

⁴ D'Alessio (1997), 43–4; for Tantalus and Niobe see Rutherford and Naiden (1996).

Supplement Z

A Selection of Scraps from Papyri Other than Π⁴

PAPYRI other than Π⁴ contribute many fragments too small to allow us to form a clear idea about their genre; I include a selection in the present supplement. Many of these are classed as fragments of *Paianes* by SnMae, and some may indeed be such. I arrange them by papyrus in the order Π⁵, Π⁷, Π²⁶, Π²⁹, Π³⁴, and finally Π⁴⁵.

Fragments of Π⁵

Z1 (*Pa.* VII (c))

ἀγνας ἀγί[
πεποταμ[
]ἀπολ[

Z2 (*Pa.* VII (d) and (e))

. . . ροαιπ[
σέ τε καὶ ῥαδ[
(gap of about 42 lines)
]μικτος ἀλω-
]αν ἴν' ἀγλαοχαίταν

Z1 Π⁵ fr. IX^v

Z2 Π⁵ frs. X' and X^v

4]ἈΝ ΤΑΝ

(Z1) . . . holy . . . fly . . . (Z2) . . . where the one with splendid hair

Π⁵ may well have consisted entirely of Paeans. These three fragments are grouped with D7 by SnMae, but it is not certain that either of them comes from that song. The reference to flying in Z1 (ποτάομαι only here in Pindar) could be connected with fragments of the *Paianes* that relate to flying, such as F2, F8, and H1.¹

¹ Apollo was also described flying in a fragment from the so-called *Hymn to Apollo Ptoius* (fr. 51a).

Fragments of Π⁷

| Z3 (<i>Pa.</i> XXII (<i>k</i>)) | | Z4 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| |]τ.[...].α.[| .]εικερ[|
| |]..ιτ.. |]οσευχομ[|
| |]οδα |]α Πιερίδεσ[|
| |]ανους ὑπὸ θεσπεσι[|]νω τ[|
| 5 |]τας | |
| |]μν. γ τ' ἐπὶ ἐθνει[| |
| |] | Z5 |
| |]ον πέδον [| |
| |]ασαι δ' ..[|]νατοι νιν. [|
| 10 |]οναμ[|]εὐφρων γὰρ[|
| |]πόλιν[|]ἐβόα με. .[|
| |]ων | |
| |] | |
| |]τεφθιμε[| Z6 |
| 15 |]..ιναντ.[| |
| |]αγονον |]..ερι[|
| |]οταν |]υμον[|
| |]ικτεν[| πα]σσαλο[|
| |]οσ[| φθο]γγον [|

Z3 Π⁷ fr. Berol: 1-10 *PBerol* 11677; 10-19 *PBerol* 21114; cf. Maehler (1968); Lobel, *POxy* xxxvi (1971), 104 Z4 Π⁷ fr. 39 Z5 Π⁷ fr. 41 Z6 Π⁷ fr. 50

Z3 4 Perhaps στεφ]άνους 6 ὅ]μων? Sn 15 Αἰ]γιναν Mae 18]|κ or]|η;]ιῆτε Mae

Z4 2 πρ]οσευχομ[,]ος εὐχομ[3]Α or]Μ

Z5 1 ἀθά]νατοι or]να τοι Hunt 3 ΒΟ Perhaps μεν

Z6 1 αἰ]θρι[Hunt 3 πα]σσαλο[or Θε]σσαλο[Hunt

(Z3) ... divine spoken ... land ... city ... (Z4) ... I pray ... Pierides ...

(Z5) ... for well-disposed ... he shouted ... (Z6) ... peg ... sound ...

Z3 is composed of two fragments in the hand of Π⁷ found in Berlin. Maehler (1968) suggested that line 18 might be analysed]ιῆτε ν[ὦν,

as in D6. 121, but different analyses are possible. Z4 and Z5 might come from prayers. In Z6, if GH were right in their conjecture that the context is musical and that $\pi\alpha]\sigma\alpha\lambda\omicron[$ is to be read in line 3, one might compare Simonides, *PMG* 519 fr. 41.²

Z7

]β.ι.[...].
 ᾶ]μφιπολε.[
 ἰπ]ποσόα θυ[γάτηρ

Z8

]·ειταυ[
]ν Αὐλίδ[
]νεν α[
]νε.[

Z9–Z10 (*Pa.* VII (*f*))

$\frac{\xi}{\eta}$ Ὀρσο]τρίαινα[
]εν Πτωιω[ι
] †
]εν σοφ[

Z11–Z12

]αν.[
]‡ [
].ραπ[

Z7 Π' fr. 51 Z8 Π' fr. 49 Z9–10 Π' fr. 47 Z11–12 Π' fr. 84

Z7 2 1[Hunt Z8 3 ᾶ Z9 2 Πτῶψ Hunt; Πτωῖψ Wil

(Z7) . . . serves . . . the horse-driving daughter . . . (Z8) . . . Aulis . . .
 (Z9) . . . trident-raiser . . . in the Ptoian . . . (Z10) . . . wise . . .

In Z7 the reference is clearly to Artemis, as at *Ol.* 3. 26; the same epithet is used of sunlight at A1. 7. Z8 could belong with A1; cf. A4. The asterisks indicate division between songs; perhaps a title written in the column was framed by columns, as in *PSI* 1181 (= Bacch. fr. 60–1).³ SnMae group Z9–10 with D7, but the fragments could come from anywhere, and not necessarily a *Paian*. Z11–12 have been supposed to come from D2–3 or S2.

Z13

]ρ[

Z14

]ι· δω[

² See further Rutherford (1990), 183 ff.

³ Stephen (1959), 7.

| | | | |
|---|---------------|----|----------------|
| |]α.[| |]..ναν.[|
| |] καὶ τόθι ν[| |] τεμ. .εὐ τ[|
| | Ἐν]υαλίου | |]αμεναι[|
| 5 |]πατρὸς ἐχ[| 5 |]ταις τερ[|
| |]δίκη δασ[| |]παισὶ τε.[|
| |]α κέλευσ.[| |]ντια. .[|
| |] [| |]μμελε[|
| |]..[| |]ε. .νεκ.[|
| | | 10 |]..[.]..[.]α.[|
| | | |]λ. .[|

Z15 (Pa. XII (c))

Z16 (Pa. XII (d))

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--|-------------|
| |]...[.]..[| |]να. .[|
| |]ωρθ' ὑποκρ[| | κ]ίθαριν τ[|
| |]ωσομεν γ[| |]λεμον π[|
| |]ἔθνος αιδ[| |]η. .με[|
| 5 |]..εχρ[...].ε[| | |

Z17 (Pa. XII (e))

]κινδυν[
]νεφέλα.ε[
].κατεργω[
]....[

Z13 Π' fr. 34 Z14 Π' fr. 38 Z15 Π' fr. 46+a new fragment (=Π' 13)
 Z16 Π' fr. 48+two new fragments (=Π' 14) Z17 Π' fr. 68 (=Π' 15)

Z13 7 I[Hunt 8 surface broken away
 Z14 (badly rubbed) 2]ÇΑ or]ΕΛ 3 τεμενει Hunt 7 ΔΕ[Hunt 8 ε]μ-
 μελε[, πλη]μμελε[Hunt
 Z15 1]ΘΑΝ[or]ΑΙ[2 ὑποκρ[ισι? But perhaps ὑπὸ κρ[5]μεχρ[Hunt
 Z16 2 Sn 3 πὸ], ἰά] Sn
 Z17 2 ΓΕ[, ΠΕ[, ΤΕ[νεφέλαγε]ρετ D'Alessio (1991) 3]Ν,]ΗΙ 4]Ν,]ΛΙ
 ΠΑΝ[, ΠΛΥ[

(Z13) . . . and there . . . Enualios . . . father . . . order . . . (Z14) . . . to the

children . . . (Z15) . . . tribe . . . (Z16) . . . lyre . . . (Z17) . . . danger . . .
cloud . . .

Fragments of Π²⁶

Z18–Z19 (Pa. XXII (c))

Z20 (Pa. XXII (d) + (e))

| | | | |
|---|--------|----|-----------------------|
| | αδ[| |].[|
| | τῆσ[| |]. λ' δ[|
| | ο.[| |]. ις[|
| | . λ. [| 4a |].[|
| 5 | [| 4b |].[.]θατ[|
| | νέο[| 5 |]λ.[.]του[|
| | στ[| |]. εἰτεμ[.]...[|
| | . [| |]ωτον τόδε κᾶ[|
| | μ[| |]...εσσι λυ.[.]· αἰψ[|
| | | |]. δ' εἰς [A]χέροντα[|
| | | 10 |].[...]. []ε.[.]ξέ[|
| | | |]ον βαλ[|
| | | |]. α κῶ.[|
| | | |]δωμαινᾶ[|
| | | |]ωοιτοτ[|

Z18–19 Π²⁶ fr. 65

Z20 Π²⁶ fr. 75

Z18–19 6 γέρο[ν μῆ]λο[ς] τοῦ[τ] Sn (assuming that Z18–19 and Z20 come from the same column) 8 φ[ι], γο[υ], ιο[υ], ο[υ]

Z20 2]Α or]Λ Α' Ἄ[4b]Ν[,]ΑΙ[,]ΑΙ[,]ΑΝ[5 ο[υ], Ε[ι], ο[υ] Υ[or Ἰ 7]ΩΤΟΝ, i.e.]ωτόν or]ωτόν: γν[ωτόν, κροκ[ωτόν, ἀλυσι]ωτόν (cf. fr. 169a. 28) Rutherford; (if accent is erroneous) ἐλαχύν[ωτον, ἀρίγν[ωτον Sn K²: κᾶ[καρπον or κᾶ[νιππον Sn 8]Β,]Θ,]Ρ Ο[ι, ζ[ι]: λῦσ[α]; Sn 9 suppl. Lobel 10]ΕΟ[or]ΕΡ[12 Ἀἰ 13 δῶμ' αἶνα[Mae

(Z19) New . . . (Z20) . . . to Acheron

Z18–19 contains the end of one song and the start of another, and the opening contained a reference to something new (cf. *Ol.* 3. 4). In Z20 Snell suggested that]ωτον in line 7 might represent an adjective

with geographical reference such as ἐλαχύν]ωτον (cf. G4. 5; D4. 14), but the accent is an obstacle.

Z21 (fr. 60 (a))

—]ινδ[
 θυμον δ[
 εἰ δέ μοι[
 γαῖαν τίμ[
 5 Ζηνί γε πα[
 Ἐννοσίδα[ι
 . . .]ερτέρα[
 . . .]οφοῖς[
 γ]νωτόν· ἴτ[
 10 π]άρεδρον
 ἀ]λλὰ γὰρ τ.[
 . .]ἀκραδι[
 . .]μακ[
 . .]ν μητι[
 15]ν . . ἔβ[

Z22 (Pa. XXII (g))

— . . τ[] . . [
]εῖπ[. .] . .]λ[. .] . [
]ἀρηΐφιλον
 κα]λῆσσαμένα
 5]πείρατο γλυκῖν[
] . .]φ . .]αλλ[
]γαρχ[. [
]ά . εἰ
] . [

Z23–Z24 (Pa. XXII (h))

—]αθανα[
]ερα, σε[
]λον
]εδοῖς . [
 5]αθῆεισεν[
 Αἰγινή[ταις εἰς
 [⌘]]Αἰακ[

Z21 Π²⁶ fr. 105Z22 Π²⁶ fr. 79+80, joined by LobelZ23–4 Π²⁶ fr. 86

(previously POxy 1787 fr. 8 = PMG 918(b))

Z21 1 ΔΕ[, ΖΑ[, ΞΕ[1–2 τλά-|θυμον Sn 3 ΔΕ Γ[, Π[, Η[, Ν[4 Τί
 5 Ἄ 6 Lobel 7 ν[, ὑπ[, φ] TE 8 Οἱ: σ]οφοῖς Sn O 9 ΤΟΝ· ἴτ[
 ἴτ[έον Sn 10]ἀρέδρο[Π 12]Μ,]Π 13]Ι or]Ν 14]ΙΝ,]ΗΝ
 Z22 1]Τ[or]Π]ΟΛ[,]ΡΑ[2]ΛΑ[,]ΛΛ[4 or τε] Sn 5 (ἐ)]πείρα
 or (ἐ)]πειράτο Sn

Z23–4 4 δαπ]έδοις Rutherford 1-[, Γ[, Π[, Ν[5]Α,]Λ 6 Space before
 and after this line suppl. Lobel 7 ὄνο]μακ[λύτα D'Alessio (1997) (cf. D6.
 123)

(Z21) . . . spirit . . . but if to me . . . earth honour . . . to Zeus . . . the

Earthshaker . . . the wise . . . known . . . sitting beside . . . But . . . (Z22) . . .
 Dear to Ares . . . calling . . . tested sweet . . . (Z23) . . . Athena . . . (Z24) *For*
the Aeginetans to . . . Aiakos

SnMae suggested that Z22 may be about an illicit relationship.⁴
 We have no idea as to the context, but nothing suggests that the
 fragment is from a *Paian*. The title in Z24 provides evidence of
 another Pindaric song for the Aeginetans; Snell suggested that fr.
 242 might be the start of the song: ἃ μὲν πόλις Αἰακιδᾶν ('The city
 belongs to the Aiakidai').

Z25 (Pa. XXII (i))

]ο δέρκεν ἐπόμοσσ[
]γέτι· τὰν παῖδα δε[
]βρόταν καγχερριθ[έτ. .
]εν[. . .]παρε[

Z26

Z27

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------|--|-------|
| | | (a) | | |
| | | | | . . [|
| | |] . . σανταπόγ. [| | . [|
| | | Γ]οργόνος· [| | [|
| | |] . ον [| | λε[|
| | |] . αλόν· [] [| | [|
| 5 | |] [| | [|
| | (b) |] [| | |
| | |] [| | |
| |] [|] [| | |
| |] . ωριω[|] ως· [| | |

Z25 Π¹⁶ fr. 87 (earlier POxy 1787 fr. 71 = PMG 918(b)) Z26 Π¹⁶ fr. 34 Z27 Π¹⁶
 fr. 94

Z25 2 ÉTI· Aī 3 ἄμ] Mae BP.T ἌΝΧΕΡΡ.ἰΘ[: suppl. Lobel

Z26 2 Slater (1969a) 8 Ὠρίω[ν]ος Lobel

⁴ In their apparatus they suggest that line 4 might refer to the seduction of Bellerophon by Anteia, or Peleus by Hippolyte, or Phrixus by Demodice (cf. fr. 49; Hyginus, *Astr.* 2. 20).

Fragments of Π⁴⁵

| | Z30
(<i>Pa.</i> VIIIb (e)) | Z31
(<i>Pa.</i> VIIIb (c)) | Z32
(<i>Pa.</i> VIIIb (d)) |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | (a) | (b) | |
| | |]. . . [|]μϵ . [|
| |] . [. . .]τϵ[|]βα[|]νηρ[|
| |] . ἐωιεπ[|] . γεν[|]υ [|
| |]π . [|] . εϛ[] [|] . [|
| 5 | |]λος [| 5]ος εν φ[|
| |]βροτων[|]ν [|]νπαί'ο[|
| |]αι . [|]μαριπ[|]εραπο[|
| |] . χ . [|] . σ . s τε γηρα[|] . . . [|
| | |]ησ[. [| |
| | | 10] . [. . .]τ[]σ[| |
| | |] . ὦντ . [| |
| | |]νοσομ[| |
| | |]ορ' . [] . [| |
| | |] . υ . [| |

Z30 Π⁴⁵ fr. 6a+bZ31 Π⁴⁵ fr. 3Z32 Π⁴⁵ fr. 4

Z30 Gap between (a) and (b) of uncertain length 3 ἐπ[ι]κώμιο[Lobel in *POxy* vol. lvi; ἰεώιε π[αιάν] Rutherford 4]ΤΟ or]ΓΟ 8]ΞΥΤ[,]ΞΥΠ[

Z31 2 Α[or Λ[3]ΠΙ Mae 5 παι]άνα Rutherford 7 ΑΡ ἀμ[ι]π[ρεπ- Mae 12 χθον]ός δμ[φαλ- Lobel in *POxy* vol. lvi

Z32 2 ἀ]νήρ[? 7 θ]εραπο[ντ- Lobel in *POxy* vol. lvi

(Z30) . . . in the revel (?) . . .

At Z30. 3 the editors suggest ἐπ[ι]κώμιο[, though they allow that the gap between the two fragments may well have been much larger. In any case, the word-family ἐπικώμιο[is especially appropriate to *Epinikia* and might be thought out of place in a *Paian*.⁵ Another possibility would be ἰεώιε π[αιάν], with grave accent in the papyrus

⁵ We find it in *Pyth.* 10. 6; *Nem.* 6. 32; 8. 50.

over the first ϵ signifying that the ancient editors regarded $\dot{\iota}\epsilon\acute{\omega}\iota\epsilon$ as a single utterance.

Metrical Appendix

WITHOUT the music, the degree to which we can expect to understand the metrical structure of the songs is limited. There are three parts to the metrician's task: (1) transcription of the metrical structure, distinguishing metrical units within the strophe (i.e. periods); (2) description of the metre, represented here to the right of the metrical scheme; and (3) analysis of the development of the metre within the strophe. I represent (3) by typographical devices in the transcription and description, and articulate it in notes after the analysis.

1. TRANSCRIPTIONS OF METRICAL STRUCTURE

The most easily recognizable metrical unit is the stanza. Stanzas are usually arranged in triads in the pattern AAB, where A is the strophe and B is the epode. Sometimes the arrangement is monostrophic: AAA . . . Usually the stanza contains smaller metrical units within it, now called periods. A period is a sequence of words linked in metrical continuity or synapheia; where synapheia is relaxed, we normally expect to find two things: first, regular word-break, sometimes manifested as hiatus between vowels; second, a position of variable prosodic quantity, since because of the lack of synapheia the quantity of the last position of a period is never fixed. Neither of these conditions is sufficient in itself to postulate a period end, but the combination usually is.

The papyri transmit the songs divided into lines ranging from 3 to 16 syllables. The origins of the line divisions in our papyri may be pre-Hellenistic, though Hellenistic scholars probably refined it, chief among them Aristophanes of Byzantium.¹ Small variations in the colometry exhibited in the papyri may represent the contributions of different editors.² In the transmitted arrangement, points of relaxed synapheia usually correspond to breaks between lines; the number of exceptions in the *Paianes* is very small.³ Some lines are periods, but more commonly lines are shorter; often a period spans two lines, and sometimes more. Many divisions between lines do not even correspond to points of regular word-break.

¹ See pp. 146-7.

² For small variations in colometry see p. 148.

³ This is certain in D6 s10-1, less certain at other points in D6; perhaps at A1 s4-5; and also at one point (probably incorrectly) in B2.

Why did Hellenistic metricians divide periods into lines? And how did they distinguish lines within periods? These issues are not well understood. There may have been a general sense that lyric poetry ought to fall into lines of around 10 syllables, and no more than 16. In determining what should count as a line, metrical feel must have played a part, but so might other factors, such as the desire to accentuate the rhetorical structure of one instance of the metrical pattern, particularly the beginning. Thus, in B2 the transmitted arrangement of the first three lines suits the rhetorical structure, but obscures the metrical symmetry.

The fragmentary nature of our texts makes it much harder to detect points of relaxation of *synapheia* or of regular word-break. The more instances of a pattern that survive the better. Where only a single strophe or epode survives, we cannot determine regular breaks at all, and we have to rely on the Hellenistic line division. Given this situation, there are two directions in which analysis might proceed:

1. Any Hellenistic line should be assumed to be a period unless one can show that it is not.
2. Period breaks should be postulated only where they can be shown to have existed; otherwise, we must assume that Hellenistic lines stood in *synapheia*.

Of these, (2) might be more accurate when dealing with the more complete songs, but (1) is the only practical course when dealing with the more fragmentary ones. It is also simpler, because it adheres more closely to the transmitted line division. Accordingly, I employ this method throughout.

I analyse strophe and epode into metrical units, which I designate with the symbols 's1 ff.' (for strophe) and 'e1 ff.' (for epode). Ideally, metrical units would be periods, but in practice they correspond to transmitted lines, except where there is reason to doubt the transmitted colometry.

My use of symbols follows established practice, and coincides for the most part with that of West (1982). The following symbols may need elucidation:

- . a syllable of uncertain quantity⁴
- (~), (-) a metrical position the existence of which is uncertain (either in a lacuna or in the text where there are alternative ways of analysing the metrical pattern)
- ..(.) lacuna comprising two or three syllables
- | regular word-break⁵
- || confirmed break between periods
- ||| strophe end or beginning

⁴ NB. In the text the symbol ⊗ is used with this value.

⁵ Where a line ends without | there is no confirmation of regular word-break at this point.

- π break between lines in the colometry of the papyrus (used only when such breaks do not correspond to breaks between lines in my transcription)

2. DESCRIPTION OF METRICAL PATTERNS

The extant fragments are in one of two metrical types: aeolo-choriambic or dactylo-epitrite. Aeolo-choriambic is characterized by sequences in which the central unit is a choriamb, expanded in various ways. Convention identifies the basic sequences as those in which the choriamb is expanded to the left with $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ or $\text{---} \times \text{---}$ (--- means --- or ---) and to the right with $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$. Some sequences have traditional names (glyconic, dodrans, adonean, pherecratean, hagesichorean, hipponactean, telesilleian, reizianum), others are described as anaclastic forms of these, where the double short is displaced two positions to the left or the right, this displacement being denoted by the symbol " to either side of the name. Furthermore, some sequences can also be thought of as acephalous or catalectic versions of others, and the symbol for this is ^ before or after the name.

5 syllables

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

adonean

ad

6 syllables

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

reversed dodrans

dod"

$\times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

reizianum

r = ^gl^

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

dodrans

dod

7 syllables

$\times \text{---} \times \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic telesilleian

tl"

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

pherecratean

ph = gl^

$\times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

telesilleian

tl = ^gl

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic pherecratean

"ph

8 syllables

$\text{---} \text{---} \times \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic glyconic

gl"

$\times \text{---} \times \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic hagesichorean

hag"

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

glyconic

gl

$\times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

hagesichorean

hag

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic glyconic

"gl

9 syllables

$\times \text{---} \times \text{---} \times \text{---}$

anaclastic enneasyllable

enn"

$\text{---} \text{---} \times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic hipponactean

hi"

$\times \text{---} \times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

enneasyllable

enn

$\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

hipponactean

hi

$\times \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$

anaclastic enneasyllable

"enn

10 syllables (not usually recognized, but useful)

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| x - x - x - u - | tr + dod" | trdod" (cf. B2 s1) |
| x x - u - u - | decasyllable | dec |
| - u - u - u - | dod + ia | dodia (cf. D6 e1) |

These basic sequences can be adapted in various ways.

1. *Resolution of a long syllable into two shorts.* In particular, superior (as in ph, gl^u) indicates that the first or last long syllable is resolved.

2. *Further forms of anaclassis.* Instead of the sequence - u - after the choriamb we sometimes find - u - u -; this is denoted by the symbol * after a name. Instead of the sequence u - u - after the choriamb we may find - u - u -; this is denoted by the symbol # after a name. Thus:

| | | |
|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| "gl* | anaclastic glyconic | - u - u - u - |
| "gl# | anaclastic glyconic | - u - u - u - |
| hag* | anaclastic hagesichorean | x - u - u - u - (see on D2) |
| "ph* | anaclastic pherecratean | - u - u - u - |

3. *Expansion.* Aeolo-choriambic sequences can be expanded externally, by the addition of sequences such as the following:

| | | <i>Equivalent to</i> | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| x - u - | iambic metron | ia | |
| - u - | syncopated iambic metron | ^ia | cretic (cr) |
| - - | syncopated iambic metron | ia^ | baccheius |
| - - | syncopated iambic metron | ^ia^ | spondee |
| - u - , - u - | syncopated/resolved iambic metra | ^ia, ^ia | fourth and first paeon |
| - u - | trochaic metron | tr | |
| - u - | dactyl | da | |
| - u - | anapaestic metron | an | |
| - u - | choriamb | ch | |

In one case there is some uncertainty. This is

| | | |
|---|----------|---|
| x | dochmiac | δ |
|---|----------|---|

which is probably found in D4 s3.

Expansion of basic aeolo-choriambic sequences can also be internal, usually by dactyls (da) and choriamb (ch). Using Nagy's (1990) symbols, I indicate dactylic expansion by @da, @zda etc. for sequences internally expanded by one or two dactyls (and so on), and the rarer choriambic expansion by @ch etc.

Even this does not exhaust the types of sequences found in aeolo-choriambic. In addition, we sometimes find sequences that are purely dactylic, or purely iambic.

To turn to songs in dactylo-epitrite, in analysing these, I make use of the following sequences:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| υυ- | d (in other contexts called 'ch' for choriamb) |
| υυ-υυ- | D |
| υυ-υυ-υυ- | D ² |
| -υ- | e |
| -υ-x-υ- | E |

A problem posed by metrical description is that the same sequence can often be described in different ways; which one prefers may have something to do with one's interpretation of the overall structure of the song. For example, in D2 there seem to be many instances of hag*, so that in periods which could be described as containing either hag* or a different sequence, one may prefer hag*; similarly with hag in the case of D6. Similar problems are posed by the analysis of certain dactylic sequences. For example, A1 s7 -υυ-υυ|-υυ-υ-|| can be described as a complex aeolo-choriambic sequence dod@zda, but it might also be (among other possibilities) a sequence of four dactyls with an anceps last syllable (4da).

In my description of D2 I have experimented with the sort of analysis advocated by Thomas Cole (1988) where units overlap ('epiploke'). The symbol I use for overlapping is ~; thus, hag*~hag* means hag* overlapping with hag*, which in s4 works out as:

- - υ υ - - x - υ υ - υ - ||

3. DEVELOPMENT OF STRUCTURE WITHIN THE STANZA

In the analyses that follow I have tried to give suggestions about the progression of the metrical type through the song. Some of key points to look for are these:

1. The metrical type can vary from one part of the song to another. The main types are aeolo-choriambic, iambic, and dactylic. A stanza can start in aeolo-choriambic and modulate to dactylic or iambic. In the description these trends can be suggested by grouping similar components in vertical alignment.⁶

2. There are usually similarities between the sequences found in a given metrical structure. Some sequences occur many times, and can be thought of as 'dominants', to use a musical metaphor. Others seem to be inversions or adaptations of these common sequences. How to code these patterns is one of the greatest challenges facing modern metrical theory. I have marked what I judge to be dominants sometimes by underlining (or overlining) them in the transcription, and sometimes by the use of bold type in the description. For coding similarities between sequences I admire Martin

⁶ West (1982), 64 ff.; Cole (1988), *passim*; SnMae represent a sequence that they interpret as a mutation of a sequence that occurred earlier in the structure by the use of italic parentheses; for example, a sequence interpreted as a mutation of a glyconic that occurs earlier in the structure is represented as (*gl*).

West's typographical device of linking similar sequences with vertical lines, though I have not followed it, and have restricted myself to a few remarks on similarities in notes after the transcriptions and descriptions.

3. The complexity of periods and sequences to some extent reflects the shape of the strophe: more complex sequences tend to come in the middle, whereas at the end of stanzas we find virtual repetitions of aeolo-choriambic sequences, or simple iambic sequences, contrasting with earlier aeolo-choriambic or dactylic.

I gave a general account of the metre of surviving *παίâves* in §7f of Part I. The metrical structure of most surviving *Paianes* of Pindar is similar to that of the *Epinikia*, except that the stanza length is in some cases greater (see §18 n. 3). Dactylo-epitrite is rare (D5 and G10). Most are in aeolo-choriambic with either iambic expansion (usually external) or dactylic expansion (often internal), and often both. Simple dactylic sequences seem to be characteristic (A1 and D4). Cretic, paeonic, or bacchiac feet (= $\hat{\text{ia}}$, $\hat{\text{ia}}$, etc.) seem no more common than in the *Epinikia*, but notice D1 s-3 and -2, B2 s1, C1 final line, D4 e6.

I now consider the metre of the major fragments.

A1

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| s1 | x- - - - - - - - - - | gl@2da |
| s2 | - - - - - - - - - - | ia gl |
| s3 ⁷ | x- - - - - - - - - - π- - - - - | ia 5da $\hat{\text{ia}}$ (or ia 4da dod) |
| s4 | - - - - - - π- - - - - - - - - - | dod~ D ² |
| s5 | x- - - - - - - - - - | gl@da |
| s6 | - - - - - - - - - - - - | 2da dod (roughly gl@da) |
| s7 | - - - - - - - - - - | ~tl |
| s8 | - - - - - - - - - - | dod~ $\hat{\text{ia}}$ - ("enn-?)" |
| s9 | - - - - - - - - - - | r $\hat{\text{ia}}$ ("enn?)" |
| e1 | - - - - - - - - - - } - - - - - - - - - - } | ~tl~tl |

The overall impression is of aeolo-choriambic with dactylic expansions.

⁷ s3-4 contain many problems. The transmitted colometry is:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|----------------|
| s3Π | x- - - - - - - - - - | ia 4da |
| s4Π | - - - - - - - - - - | gl@da (?) |
| s5Π | - - - - - - - - - - | D ² |

An obstacle to this is the single case of a long syllable in s4Π in line 44 (*στρατὸν καί* for the expected - - -). We could deal with this by emendation (see the apparatus), but Housman (1908) saw that the regular short syllable at the end of s3Π and s4Π suggests how to rearrange the colometry. Turyn (1948), 272-3, goes half way:

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| s3 ^T | x- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ia 5da $\hat{\text{ia}}$ |
| s4 ^T | - - - - - - | dod |
| s5 ^T | - - - - - - - - - - | ~D ² |

Such sequences as gl@da and gl@2da are rare in the *Epinikia*. They are, on the other hand, characteristic of the *παῖάν* genre: there are parallels in D₄ (gl@da is one form of the basic unit 'P' in my analysis);⁸ in the Erythraean *παῖάν* to Asclepius (*PMG* 934) the 4da sequence is about the same as gl@2da;⁹ and in the *Paian* to Sleep in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (827 ff.) the first line is the same as s6 here. These metres seem to be particularly cultic, as I stressed in §7f.¹⁰ s1 is identical to a line used often by Sappho, e.g. in *PLF* 44 (which ends with a reference to *παῖάν*-singing); songs in this metre made up book 2 of her works (fr. 227 = Hephaestion, *Enkh.* 7. 7, 23. 14 ff. Consbruch). s6-7 have a lively symmetry which adds punch to the prayer in the second half of the first strophe. The last lines seem to be anacastic aeolo-choriambic cola with iambic cadences.¹¹ I note a quasi-rhyme at the end of s9 in the first strophe (Θήβας) and the first antistrophe (θήσεις).

A2. Line 20 seems to be tel, which suggests that this was aeolo-choriambic with dactylic/iambic expansion.

B1. The final line is ∪---∪--- |||, which recalls the final line of the epode of *Olympian* 2.¹²

B2

s1¹³ ∪---∪---∪---
 ∪---∪---∪---
 ∪---∪---∪---
 ∪---∪---∪---

gl''∪∪gl'', roughly 2(×gl'')

⁸ See pp. 452-3. The best study of these sequences is in Koster (1953: 54 n. 1), who devised a special terminology for them. We find individual parallels in *Pyth.* 2, *Ol.* 10, and *Nem.* 6. As for D₄, there are cases of gl@da in s4 and e5 (in both cases preceded by ia); gl@3da in s5 and ∪tl@da in a1 and e4 are clearly related.

⁹ The metre of the Erythraean *παῖάν* to Asclepius is dactylic: 4da | D² || iē *Παῖάν* | 4da | 7da⁺ || 2ia | D || iē *Παῖάν* |||. See West (1982), 141. Wilamowitz (1909), 45, regarded the two instances of iē *Παῖάν* (sic) as in synapheia with the periods preceding in each case, with the rough breathing counting as a consonant.

¹⁰ This type of metre is discussed by Ax (1932) and Korzeniewski (1968), 80.

¹¹ See T. Cole (1988), 157; the analysis of s8 as anacastis for ∪---∪---∪--- is due to Korzeniewski (1968), 7.

¹² Korzeniewski (1968), 218, takes this as the larger part of a choriambic dimeter.

¹³ In s1, for the resolution ∪--- cf. D₄ s3. For the structure cf. D₆ e15 (enn 'enn), and the possible analysis zenn'' at the start of D₇. The transmitted colometry is:

∪---∪---∪--- ∪ia ∪∪ia ∪ia⁺
 ∪---∪---∪--- tl
 ∪---∪---∪--- dod''

The obscurity of this and the symmetry of the pattern I have suggested seem to justify the interpretation I propose.

| | | |
|------------------|---|--------------|
| s2 ¹⁴ | υ υ - υ υ - υ - | gl |
| s3 | - - [] - υ υ . - - υ υ . [| |
| s4 | - - υ υ - υ υ - [| |
| s5 | υ υ - υ - - . [| |
| s6 | υ υ - υ υ - υ . [| |
| s7 | - - υ υ - υ υ - | - D |
| | - - υ υ - υ υ . | tel (?) |
| s8 | . . (.)] - - υ υ - [| |
| s9 |] - - υ υ . [- |] - - ia |
| e1 | . - [| |
| e2 | - - - υ υ - υ (υ) - [| |
| e3 | υ υ - υ υ - υ - [| ~ tel |
| e4 | - - - υ υ . - [| |
| e5 | - - - υ υ - υ - - [| ph@da |
| e6 | υ υ . υ υ - υ υ | ~ tel (?) |
| e7 | - (υ) - - - - (υ) - (?) υ υ - υ υ - υ - | tr gl@da (?) |
| e8 | - (υ) - - υ υ . υ - | gl (?) |
| e9 | . - - - - υ υ | ^ia ia? |
| e10 | - υ υ - υ - [- . | |
| e11 | υ - - - - υ υ - [. | dod@da |
| e12 | . - - υ υ - - - υ υ - [υ - | zia^ tel (?) |

Aeolic with iambic expansion. In the opening line of the strophe the triple short framed by long syllables suggests a paeon, and the initial baccheus adds to the cretic-paeonic quality.

B₃

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| s10 ¹⁵ | - υ υ - υ υ υ υ - | |
| | - υ υ - υ υ | dod@2ch (=2ch dod) |
| s13 | .] υ - υ υ - - [- | dod" ^ia^ |
| s14 | υ - υ - - υ υ - [υ - | ia dod |

Apparently aeolo-choriambic with iambic expansion.

C1. The final line is υ υ υ - . [. . .] |||, which suggests a paeon.

C₂

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| s1 | υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - | |
| | υ υ - υ υ - υ . | ia dod^ dod (similar to gl" tel) |
| s14 | υ - υ - υ - υ υ - υ - - υ υ - | ia dod"@ch |

¹⁴ Positing period end after *μελίφρονι* in line 78; the transmitted colometry of s2-3 is:

υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - - [] -
υ υ . - - υ υ . [

¹⁵ In s10 dod@2ch recalls the choriambic sequence in D6 s5.

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | - - - - - | "gl |
| | - - - - - | D |
| s15 | - - - - - | ia ^ia ? |
| s16 | - - - - - | D ² |
| s17 | - - - . [. (.)] - - - - - | |
| e6 | υ(υ) - - - - - | ph@da ^ia? |
| e7 | - - - - - | ~"enn |
| e8 | - . - - - | |
| e9 | - - - - - | r |
| e10 | - - - - - | dod@da |

Again aeolo-choriambic with iambic and dactylic expansion.

D1

| | | |
|------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| sn-3 | - - - - - [υ -] υ - | ^ia zia |
| sn-2 | - - - - - | z^ia ia |
| sn-1 | - - - - - (υ) υ - | zia? |
| sn | - - - - - | ~"dod" |
| e1 | - - - - - | ia hi" |
| e2 | - - - - - | ^ia^ ia |
| e3 | - - - - - | ia zia^ |
| e4 | - - - - - | gl" ^ia ia^ |
| | - - - - - | |
| e5 | - - - - - | ia ch ad (similar to hi"@ch) |
| e6 | (υ) - - - - - | (~)D ² |

The surviving sections show a strong iambic coloration, with plenty of ^ia, which makes this the most cretic-looking fragment of Pindar's *Paianes*. Other lines are aeolo-choriambic and dactylic (e6 is identical to A1 s5, as D'Alessio (1988a) notes).

D2. (The lines indicate instances of hag*.)

| | | Description | Epipeke |
|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| s1 | - - - - - x - - - - - | ph ^zia^ | |
| s2 | x - x - - - - | ia ia^^ | |
| s3 | - - - - - π - x - - - - | ~gl ph | |
| s4 ¹⁶ | - - - - - x - - - - - | r hag* | hag*~hag* |
| s5 | - - - - - π - - - - - | ph~ r ¹⁷ | ph~~ ph |
| s6 | - - - - - π - - - - - | hag r (tl ph) | hag~hag" |

¹⁶ Turyn thinks there are 9 periods in the strophe, splitting s5 and s6 into two at the points of regular word-break. In s5 this seems to be purely a matter of length; in s6 it is possible that the second syllable of ἐκὰς (line 44) should scan short, in which case it would have to be *brevi in longo*.

¹⁷ Note the similar final words in two instances of s5: γένεσθαι in line 43 and φέρεσθαι in line 79.

| | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|---------------------|
| s7 | <u>---o---o-</u> <u>π</u> o---o--- | r hag | hag*~hag |
| e1 | <u>---o---o-</u> <u>π</u> o---o--- | hag@zch | |
| e2 | <u>---o---o-</u> <u>π</u> o---o--- | ch hi* (ad hag *) | ^hag*~
hag* |
| e3 | -----o--- | hi'' | |
| e4 | o---o---o---o- | ~tl@da | |
| e5 | o---o---o--- <u>π</u> o---o--- | 2 "gl# | |
| e6 | o---o---o--- <u>π</u> x- o---o- | ~ph hag * | hag*~hag* |
| e7 | ---o---o--- | dec | |
| e8 | o---o---o--- <u>π</u> o---o--- | gl r | |
| e9 | <u>o---o-</u> <u>o---o-</u> <u>π</u> o---o--- | 3r (or ch dod'' ph) | hag*~
hag*~hag'' |

Mainly aeolo-choriambic with iambic expansion; s2 is purely iambic (the strophe seems to begin with the more sedate iambic, before rising into snappier aeolo-choriambic, which in the opening strophe corresponds to the movement of the *χορός*). Choriambic expansion is found in e1 (a common Sapphic line: bk. 4 of her works perhaps contained songs in this metre (Voigt (1971), 19)), dactylic expansion in e4 (tl@da, which turns up also in D4 and A1).¹⁸ A defining sequence is x-o- o- (hag*), common also in *Pythian* 10. Also common is the related reizianum. The sequence o--o--o--o--o-, which occurs several times, can be analysed r hag* or with epiploke hag*~hag*. Similarly, the epode-final refrain is usually taken as three reiziana,¹⁹ although if we allow for epiploke, it can be taken as a more interesting combination of hag* and hag''. Compare the creative use of reiziana in the metrical structure of *Olympian* 9 (466 BC), where r constitutes s8 and e3 and also forms the second half of s3, s4, s5, s6, and s10. The strophe ends with the two related sequences hag r (itself a palindrome) and r hag.

D3. Perhaps aeolic with iambic elements.

D4. In my analysis of this song I make use of two types of compound sequence, underlined in the description: P x x o---o---o- (gl@da) and Q (ia, ^ia, or ia^)+(dod or dod'').

| | <i>Cola</i> | <i>P/Q analysis</i> |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| s1 | ~tl@da | P |
| s2 | ia dod | Q |
| s3 | 4ia δ ²⁰ | |
| s4 | ia gl@da | ia P |
| s5 ²¹ | gl@3da | dod'' P |

¹⁸ Koster (1953), 121, 176.

²⁰ Final element could be resolved dod.

²¹ o---o- | at the end of s5 is moved there from the start of the following line by

¹⁹ So Turyn; SnMae differ.

| | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| s6 ²² | - - - - - π - - - - - π - - - - -
- - - - - π - - - - - π - - - - - | dod D ch dod@3d
P/Q analysis: dod D zch P |
| e1 | x - - - - - - - - - - π - - - - - - - - - - | *D hag* dod"
P/Q analysis: *4da Q |
| e2 ²³ | - - - - - - - - - - π - - - - - - - - - - | zia enn zia Q |
| e3 | - - - - - - - - - - | - ch D |
| e4 | - - - - - - - - - - | ~tl@da P |
| e5 | - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ia gl@da ia P |
| e6 | - - - - - - - - - - | 3^ia |
| e7 | - - - - - - - - - - | ia ia^ ^ia^ (roughly Q) |
| e8 | - - - - - - - - - - | ^ia dod Q |
| e9 | - - - - - - - - - - | ia dod^ Q^ |

The metre of this song is aeolo-choriambic, but with heavy iambic and dactylic expansion.²⁴ The development of the strophe is initially iambic (s3, with striking repetition of the resolution - - - - -), but settles into dactylic (s5, s6). The epode starts with a dactylic sequence (e1), but moves back through ~tl@da into iambic (e6-7). e6 suggests a paeon followed by two cretics. The frequent occurrence of sequences P and Q provides unity. A form of P, ~tl@da, occurs in the first line and is repeated twice (end of s6, e4); in general, the more dactylic P occurs mostly in the strophe; the more iambic Q occurs in the second line, and otherwise in the epode, particularly in the final lines.

D5. ∪ D- D≡ | e- D- D- DD- ||| This is the only example of dactylo-epitrite metre among the surviving fragments of the *Paianes*. The pattern is very simple: the basic unit is D≡, introduced in the strophe-initial refrain with

Turyn and West, left where it is by Wilamowitz, Snell, Maehler, and Koster (1967). The transmitted arrangement is:

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|----------|
| s5 | - - - - - - - - - - | 5da^ |
| s6 | - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ia dod D |
| | - - - - - - - - - - | zch |
| | - - - - - - - - - - | tl@da |

²² T. Cole (1988), 229, suggests that there is period end after the second syllable of section 2 of s6 (εἰπέν σφι in 40 and εἶη κεν in 50), i.e.:

| | | |
|----|---------------------------|--------------|
| s6 | - - - - - - - - - - x- | dod dod* @da |
| s7 | x x - - - - - - - - - - - | gl@3da |

Metrically this is attractive, but we do not know where the word-breaks occurred in the first triad.

²³ Koster (1967) and Turyn place the first metron of e2 at the end of e1, yielding:

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------|------------------|
| e1 | x - - - - - | ≡ D |
| | - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | - ch ^ia dod" ia |
| e2 | - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ia ia^ ^tl |

²⁴ There is an excellent analysis in West (1982), 67. Koster (1967) is helpful.

an introductory breve, and developed in s3 (by an iambic expansion) and in s5 (by repetition).

D6 ("ph is underlined)

| | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| s1 | υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ π υ υ-υ-υ-υ } | ~ia ia hag |
| s2 | -υ-υ υ-υ π- υ-υ υ-υ-υ-υ | ph ia ia^ |
| s3 | -υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ | dod ^ia |
| s4 | υ-υ-υ υ-υ-υ υ-υ-υ } | ia "ph |
| s5 | υ υ υ υ υ υ-υ υ-υ π υ υ υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ | 4 ch |
| s6 | -υ-υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ | ch ph |
| s7 | x- υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ π x-υ-υ υ-υ-υ | x-2hag |
| s8 ²⁵ | -υ υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ π-υ υ υ-υ-υ-υ | ^ia ph@da D (or an D- D) |
| s9 | υ υ-υ π-υ υ-υ υ υ-υ π υ-υ-υ-υ | } υ υ-υ 7da^ 2^ia
(or υ υ-υ 5da^ an 2^ia) |
| | υ υ-υ υ-υ π υ υ υ-υ-υ | |
| s10 | υ υ-υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ υ υ-υ-υ | ~ia ia dod" |
| s11 | υ υ υ υ υ-υ-υ π υ υ-υ υ υ-υ | ~"ph ph |
| s12 | -υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ | gl" |
| s13 | -υ-υ υ-υ-υ | "ph } or ^ia hag@ch |
| e1 | -υ υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ | dodia |
| e2 | -υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ | dec |
| e3 | υ υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ [-] | ~dod" r |
| e4 | -υ-υ υ-υ | dod" |
| e5 | -υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ | ch ph |
| e6 | υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ | ~ch ph (or 2r?) |
| e7 | -υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ | dec |
| e8 | -υ υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ π-υ υ υ-υ-υ | dod@4da (6da) |
| e9 ²⁶ | (i) υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ π (ii) υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ | dec ia |

²⁵ s8-10 are difficult. My analysis is similar to Radt's, except that he splits my s9 into two periods:

| | |
|-------|-------------------------|
| sg9i | υ υ-υ υ υ υ-υ π υ-υ-υ |
| sg9ii | υ υ-υ υ-υ π υ υ-υ-υ-υ |

SnMae treat s8-9 as one period:

| | |
|----|---------------------------------------|
| s8 | -υ υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ-υ cr ph@da 3da da^ |
| | -υ υ υ-υ υ-υ |
| | -υ υ υ-υ υ-υ 6 da da^ cr cr |
| | υ-υ-υ υ υ υ-υ |
| | υ υ υ-υ υ-υ |

But this reconstruction requires that *ὑψικόμω Ἐλένα* in lines 95-6 scan as D, which seems unlikely. Gentili (1979), 16, regards the initial υ υ υ υ in s8 as a separate period ('hypodo'). (There is a further problem concerning line 134: most editors scan *βαθύκολπον ἀνέρεψατο* as υ υ-υ υ-υ υ-υ, but it is also possible that we should emend to *ἀνᾱρέψατο* and postulate that at this point an anapaest is substituted for a dactyl: see Koster (1953), 54 n. 1.)

²⁶ e9 combines two lines written out separately in Π. Radt writes them as one period, and that is surely justified by the appropriateness of the resulting se-

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| e10 | - - - π - - - - - - - - - | "ph ph (dod hag") |
| e11 | - - - - - x - - - - - π - - - - - | "ph 2ph |
| e12 ²⁷ | - - - - - | gl |
| e13 ²⁸ | - - - - - - - - - | dod" ph ("ph r) |
| e14 | - - - - - - - - x π - - - - - | ~2gl" |

The most remarkable thing about the metrical structure of D6 is its great size. The quality of the metre is aeolo-choriambic with iambic and dactylic expansion. In the middle of the strophe the aeolo-choriambic modulates to choriambic (thematically associated with water?) and then to dactylic (thematically associated with the female, according to Stehle (1996), 142 n. 71), before returning to aeolo-choriambic; the epode also modulates briefly into dactylic. In the aeolo-choriambic sections the dominant sequences seem to be ph and "ph, and ones that end in these, such as hag and hag", dec (˘ia + "dec) and ch ph (the last not common in *Epinikia*). Particularly striking is the sequence of four ph or "ph in e11-12.

Gentili suggests that the metre of D6 shows similarities to that of *Nemean* 7. This may well be so. Compare, for example, the first period of D6 with the opening of *Nemean* 7:

- - - - - - - - - - - - - ~hag ia

This metrical parallelism is one more aspect of the complex relationship between the two songs.²⁹

D7

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------|---------|-------------|
| s1 (=s13?) | - - - - - - - - - | ia hag | } or zenn"? |
| s2 | - - - - - | dod" | |
| s3 | - - - - - - - - - | ~"hi@ch | |

Aeolo-choriambic with iambic expansion. In the first line ia hag (cf. *Isth.* 7 s3) can be compared to ~ia ia hag in D6 s1. The idea that s1-2 represent zenn" is attractive (cf. my analysis of the opening of B2), but it cannot be confirmed without additional instances of the pattern.

quence. SnMae write e9(ii)-10 as one period; but period end after e9(ii) seems assured since γοι at the end of line 175 indicates an aneps. See Radt (1958) 96-7; Gentili (1979), 17; so D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988), 180.

²⁷ According to D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988) there are two alternative colometries for line 58 = 119 = 180. The one above is the longer one; the shorter one makes e12 a pherecratean and eliminates the period end before e13 (see p. 327 n. 87):

| | | |
|---------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| e(b)12d | - - - - - | ph |
| | - - - - - - - - - | dod" ph ("ph r) |
| e(b)13 | - - - - - - - - x - - - - - | ~2gl" |

²⁸ I follow D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988) in positing a period end after Μοισάν in line 181 (they do not read δ' in the following line).

²⁹ Cole's analysis ((1988), 231-2) stresses the fact that the structure exploits a contrast between two sequences - - - - - (A) and - - - - - (B).

Er

. - - - - . [
 5 (? ?)
 - - - - - . [
 .] - - - - -

Snell's suggestion that this corresponds to C2. 12-15 (=S11-14) seems improbable.

Fr. tl" ph || hag || gl" r "ph D.

Note. I do not give full metrical analyses of fragments from the remaining sections. Analyses of some of the ones I omit can be found in SnMae.

Gr

| | | |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|
| 7 | - - - - - | hag |
| | - - - - . - - - [| hi ? |
| | - - - - . - - - . [| hag ia^ (?) |
| 10 | - - - - - | D |
| | - - - - - - - - - [| ~r@da ia^ (?) |
| | - - - - . | ^ia ^ia^ |
| | - - - - - - - - - | "enn |
| | - - - - - - - - - - - | r "ph (?) |
| 15 | - - - - - - - - - | "ph ch (?) |
| | - - - - - - - - - - - [| tl" ~dod" (?) |

Aeolic with iambic and dactylic expansions. Notice in particular the common occurrence of the sequence - - - - - , apparently a resolved version of "ph.

G8 is aeolo-choriambic. The pattern becomes relatively clear at s6-7:

| | | |
|----|---------------------|--------------------------|
| s6 | - - - - - [| ia~ hag*@2da or "enn@2da |
| | - - - - - (v) - - - | |
| s7 | - - - - - | ia ia^ |

The most remarkable feature is the extremely large size of the strophe.³⁰

G9 is aeolic:

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------|------------|
| s2 | - - - - - | gl" |
| s3 | - - - - . | |
| s4 | - - - - - - - - - | 2^ia ch |
| 5 | s5 - - - - - | ia ia^ |
| | s6 - - - -] - - - - [- - - (?) | tl@da? |
| 15 | s13 - - - - - - - - . | - - gl (?) |
| | s14 - - - - - - - - - | 5da^ |

³⁰ An ambitious reconstruction in Fileni (1987), 35, 53-5.

s15 --o--o--o--o . ia dod

G10 (2-3) e- D- E- (4) d- E || (5) e (6) e- D (7) E- e |||

H3. 2ia || dod or 3ia.

H4. gl hag or -- 2"ph.

H5. D- | - d e- D e.

S1

10 . . (.) - o - o - o - o - . - . [. . (.)] gl . - .

11 . .] - o o (o) - o - o - o .

12 - o o - - o o - o - o - dod@ch ^ia

13 . (.)] - o - o - o - o - - . (.)] gl - .

Clearly aeolo-choriambic, but highly obscure; there seem to be two instances of a resolved glyconic -o-o-o-o-o-o- (10, 13). There seems to be another resolution in line 15, and sequences of at least three shorts in 6, 7, 14. Such a degree of resolution is unusual.

S2. The analysis depends on whether the song is monostrophic or triadic:

Monostrophic

s1 x o - o - [

s2 x o o - [

s3 x x - o o [-

s4 - - [] o o [

s5 - - o o - o - tl

s6 - x - - - o o [| gl"?

s7 o - o o | o o - o o - | ia tl (gl@da)

s8 - - o - o o - ||| tl"

Triadic

s1 o o o - [

s2 }

s3 }

s4 } (as in mono-

s5 } strophic pat-

s6 } tern)

s7 }

s8 }

e1 o o - . . . [

e2 - . . . [

final line-2] - o o . [

final line-1 = s7

final line = s8

Aeolo-choriambic, with distinctive tl and tl".

S3 is aeolic. e -4, e -3 are: hag"@ch ^ia, hag"@ch ^ia +?

S4 is also aeolic.³¹ s1: ph; s2: tel".

S5. Apparently dactylo-epitrite, though only a single line (s4c) is clear. Snell's analysis of fr. (a) and (b) is as follows (for full discussion see p. 421):

³¹ T. Cole (1988), 233, compares *Pyth.* 10 (strophe).

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| | s4 | - - - . [| | | |
| 15 | | - - - [] - - - [- - - - | d - E - (?) | | |
| | | - - - - - | D | | |
| | | - - . [] - - . [| | | |
| | s6 | - - - - [] - - - | | | |
| | | - - - - [] . - - [| | | |
| 20 | | - - - - [] - - - [| | | |
| 1 = 21 | | - - - - [] - - - [| | | |
| 2 = 22 | s9 | - - - . [] - - - [| | | |
| 3 = 23 | | - - - - [| | | |
| 4 = 24 | | - - - - [| | | |
| 5 = 25 | | - - - [| (b) 1-5 | (b) 20-4 | |
| 6 | s12 | - - [] - - - [] - - - - - . [| | 20 | } - - - - - |
| 7 | | - - [] - - - . [] . - - - - - . [| | | } - - - |
| 8 | | - - . [] - - - [] . . | | | } |
| 9 | s15 | - - - [] - - [] - - - - | | | } |
| 10 | | - - - . [] - . [5] - - - - - [- - | | | } |

Repertory of *Παιᾶνες* by Poets Other than Pindar

THE following list is chronological, distinguishing semi-mythological, classical, post-classical (i.e. fourth century BC), Hellenistic, post-Hellenistic, and of uncertain period. Within each period I distinguish songs/fragments attributed to specific authors, anonymous songs/fragments, and testimonia about songs or poets. For the sake of completeness I include some songs/fragments which can be assigned to the genre *παιάν* only with a limited degree of probability (I mark these with an asterisk), and also some songs whose existence is uncertain (I mark these with a question-mark).

| <i>Poet and Song</i> | | <i>Reason for classification as a
παῖάν/source (testimonia)</i> | |
|--------------------------|---|--|-------------|
| Semi-mythological | | | |
| R1? | Olen | Restored by Wilamowitz
at Ael. Arist. <i>Or.</i> 37. 18
(<i>Hymn to Athena</i>) | p. 44 n. 34 |
| R2* | Philammon of Delphi | Heracleides of Pontus, fr.
157 Wehrli = ps.-Plut. <i>Mus.</i>
1132 A, 1133 A | p. 27 |
| Archaic period | | | |
| <i>Fragments</i> | | | |
| R3 | Alcaeus, <i>PLF</i> 307 (?) | Himer. <i>Or.</i> 14. 10–11 calls
it a παῖάν | pp. 27, 91 |
| R4 | Alcman, <i>PMG</i> 98
(= 129 Calame) | Implied function | pp. 51–2 |
| R5* | Archilochus, <i>IEG</i> 121 | The song may refer to itself
as a παῖάν | p. 66 |
| R6* | Eumelus of Corinth,
<i>PMG</i> 767 | Called a <i>προσόδιον</i> by Paus.
9. 12. 5, but the Delian
context suggests it might
be from a παῖάν | p. 35 |
| R7* | Sappho, <i>PLF</i> 44 | Closing reference to παῖάν-
singing | p. 56 |
| R8 | Sappho or Alcaeus:
<i>SLG</i> 291 | Contains the word <i>παιαονα</i> | |
| R9* | Stesichorus: <i>PMG</i>
212 | Implied function; see De-
latte (1938) | p. 54 |

Attestations

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| R10 | Dionysodotus of Laconia | Athen. 678 c; Strabo 10. 4. 18 | p. 31 |
| R11 | Thaletas of Gortyn | Ps.-Plut. <i>Mus.</i> 1134 c, from Pratinas, cited <i>ibid.</i> 1146 B (= <i>PMG</i> 713 (iii)) | p. 37 |
| R12 | Tynnichus of Chalcis, <i>PMG</i> 707 | Called a <i>παῖάν</i> in Plato, <i>Ion</i> , 534 D, and Porphyry, <i>Abst.</i> 2. 10 = Aesch. <i>TrGF</i> iii. T114; the second shows that T. predates Aeschylus | p. 28 |
| R13 | Xenocritus of Locri | Mentioned in Pind. G9; ps.-Plut. <i>Mus.</i> 1134 c | pp. 90, 99, 383 |
| R14 | Xenodamus of Cythera | Ps.-Plut. <i>Mus.</i> 1134 E | pp. 90, 99–100 |

Classical period

SIMONIDES (cf. Rutherford (1990))

| | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|------------|
| R15 | <i>PMG</i> 519 fr. 35 [i] (<i>Puthais?</i>) | Content | p. 33 |
| R16 | <i>PMG</i> 519 fr. 35 [ii] (Andrian) | Title, proximity to R15 | pp. 28, 33 |
| R17 | <i>PMG</i> 519 fr. 55 (Deliades) | Content, <i>παῖάν</i> | p. 29 |
| R18 | <i>PMG</i> 519 fr. 32 (Birth of Artemis at Ephesus?) | Content | p. 32 |

Testimonia

| | | | |
|------|---|---|-------|
| R19 | <i>PMG</i> 573: Pytho-tonia and derivation of <i>Ἐκατος</i> | Ps.-Jul. <i>Ep.</i> 24. 395 D, i. 511 Hertlein = p. 236 Bidez–Cumont) | p. 28 |
| R20 | <i>PMG</i> 578: Muses sing loudly when Apollo leads the dance | Himer. <i>Or.</i> 62. 54 | |
| R21* | <i>PMG</i> 577: cult of the Muses at Delphi | Plut. <i>Pyth. orac.</i> 402 C–D | |
| R22* | <i>PMG</i> 570: Hyperbo-reans | Strabo 15. 1. 57 | |

BACCHYLIDES

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|-------|
| R23 | Fr. 4: Apollo Puthaieus at Asine; cf. Barrett (1954) | Lines 61–80 are cited from B.'s <i>Paianes</i> by Stob. 4. 14. 3 (iv. 371 W.-H.) | p. 32 |
| R24 | Fr. 5: an affirmation of poetic tradition | Cited as from a <i>παῖάν</i> in Clem. <i>Strom.</i> 5. 68. 5 | |
| R25 | Fr. 6: the proverb 'When the bear is here, do not look for tracks' | Cited as from a <i>παῖάν</i> in <i>CPG</i> i. 42. 3 | |

- R26* Ode 17: relates the story of Theseus Classed as a *Dithurambos*, but the ending suggests that it might have been a *παιάν* pp. 73, 98-9
- R27* Fr. 60 Quasi-refrain in last line, but it could be a narrative *διθύραμβος* or even a *θρήνος* p. 71

SOPHOCLES

- R28 PMG 737b: *παιάν* to Asclepius Title on the inscription p. 39
- R29 *παιάν* to Asclepius containing the epithet *κλυτόμητις* (unless this = R43) Philostr. *Imag.* 415. 7 Kaiser p. 41
- R30 Ariphron of Sicily: PMG 813 Cited as a *παιάν* by Athen. 701 F-702 B; also the function pp. 37-8
- R31* Pronomus of Thebes: PMG 767 Called *προσόδιον ἐς Δῆλον* by Paus. 9. 12. 3, but the Delian context points to a *παιάν* p. 35
- R32? Timotheus, PMG 800, address to Apollo (=the Sun) The closing refrain
- R33?* Socrates D.L. *Vita Socr.* 2. 43; Dio Prus. 43. 10 p. 91

ANONYMOUS *παιᾶνες**Spartan παιᾶνες dating perhaps from this period*

- R34 *παιάν* to Euros, PMG 858 Closing refrain p. 46
- R35 *παιάν* to Lysander, PMG 867 Plut. *Lys.* 18 calls it one of the *παιᾶνες* sung to Lysander; the final refrain is paeanic; also Duris ap. Athen. 695 E (*FGrH* 76 F 27) p. 58
- R36 Marching-*παιάν*, PMG 856; cf. the *παιάν* concerning Poseidon, R51 Nowhere called a *παιάν*, but the function is paeanic pp. 44-5

Other anonymous παιᾶνες

- R37* PMG 1018b, *παιάν* to the Fates? Function p. 37 n. 2
- R38-9 PMG 950 (a) and (b): two lines cited by Arist. *Rhet.* 3. 8, perhaps Simonidean Paeanic metre, content p. 78 n. 34
- R40 PMG 1031: a line cited by Hephaestion, *Enkh.* 42. 7 Paeanic metre p. 77

| | | | |
|------|---|--|-------------|
| R41* | POxy iv. 659 = 'Pindar fr. 338' | Reference to Delphi suggests that it <i>might</i> be from a παιάν, but it is unlikely to be by Pindar because of the W. Greek dialect form <i>λαροῖς</i> | p. 168 n. 4 |
| R42? | Song of the Μολποί of Miletus | The Μολποί inscription specifies the presence of a singer | p. 60 |
| R43 | Anonymous Erythraean παιάν to Asclepius (PMG 934); could be 4th cent. BC, but its fame suggests earlier; perhaps by a famous poet such as Sophocles | Function | pp. 39 ff. |
| R43a | SLG 453 | Contains the words παιήονα ἢ ἢ | |

Attestations

| | | | |
|------|---|--|------------|
| R44? | Delphic παιάν of Aeschylus; cf. TrGF iii T114 | Mentioned in Porph. <i>Abst.</i> 2. 10 | p. 28 |
| R45? | Diagoras of Melos | A παιάν mentioned in <i>Suda</i> , ii. 53. 16 Adler | p. 123 |
| R46 | Ion of Chios | Mentioned only in ΣAr. <i>Peace</i> , 829 = <i>Schol. Ar.</i> ii/2. 129. 8 | |
| R47 | Isodemus of Trozen | Mentioned in ps.-Luc. <i>Enc. Dem.</i> 27 | p. 41 |
| R48 | Pantacles | Antiphon 6. 11 calls him διδάσκαλος for a χορός at the Athenian Thargelia, and a παιάν would suit an Apolline festival. The διδάσκαλος could have been the poet. He is also mentioned in <i>IG</i> i/2. 771; <i>SEG</i> 24.66 = 26. 44 | |
| R49 | Phrynichus of Athens | Athen. 250 B = TrGF i. 3 Phrynichus T11 = Timaeus, <i>FGrH</i> 566 F 32 | p. 33 |
| R50 | Telestes of Selinus | Aristoxenus' <i>Life of Telestes</i> (fr. 117) mentioned Italian παιάν-writers; cf. Telestes' <i>Asklepios</i> (PMG 806-7) | |
| R51 | παιάν concerning Poseidon | Mentioned at Xen. <i>Hell.</i> 4. 7. 4 | pp. 36, 52 |

Post-classical period (fourth century BC)*Complete songs*

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|-------------|
| R52 | Aristotle, <i>PMG</i> 842 | Called a <i>παῖάν</i> at Athen. 696 A; but the genre of this song was much disputed | pp. 92 ff. |
| R53 | Philodamus of Scarpheia: <i>CA</i> 161 (340–339 BC) | Inscription; also <i>παῖάν</i> refrains | pp. 131 ff. |
| R54 | Aristonoos of Corinth, <i>Hymn to Apollo</i> , <i>CA</i> 162–4 (338 or 334 BC) | The title calls it a <i>ῥυμός</i> , but the refrains indicate a <i>παῖάν</i> ; <i>ῥυμός</i> in the title is probably used in the general sense | pp. 28 ff. |
| R55* | <i>Epidaurian Hymn to Pan</i> , <i>PMG</i> 936 | The closing invocation suggests a <i>παῖάν</i> refrain | p. 70 |

Fragments

- | | | | |
|-----|--|--|-------------|
| R56 | Anonymous Erythraean <i>παῖάν</i> to Seleukos, <i>CA</i> 140; perhaps dating from 281–280 BC | Context of the other Erythraean <i>παῖάνες</i> | p. 57 n. 80 |
| R57 | Anonymous Erythraean <i>παῖάν</i> to Apollo, <i>PMG</i> 933 | Inscription, function, <i>παῖάν</i> refrain | p. 70 |

Attestations

- | | | | |
|--------|---|---|-------------|
| R58 | Demetrius of Phaleron, <i>παῖάνες</i> in honour of Sarapis | D.L. 5. 5. 76 | p. 55 |
| R59–60 | Hermocles of Cyzicus, <i>Paianes</i> to Antigonos and Demetrius | Athen. 696 F = Philochorus, <i>FGrH</i> 328 F 165 | p. 57 n. 80 |
| R61 | Dionysius II of Syracuse | Athen. 250 C = Timaeus, <i>FGrH</i> 566 F 92 | |
| R62* | Antimachus of Colophon wrote about the birth of Apollo | According to <i>SH</i> 78 Antimachus | |

Hellenistic period*Poems and fragments*

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| R63 | Isyllus of Epidauros, <i>CA</i> 133–4 | Inscription, function | p. 41 |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|

CALLIMACHUS

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|-------------|
| R64* | <i>Hymn</i> 2 | Perhaps a <i>παῖάν</i> in hexameters | pp. 128 ff. |
| R65* | <i>Branchus</i> (fr. 229) | Imitates performance in the cult of Apollo at Didyma | p. 128 |
| R66 | Limenios of Athens, <i>CA</i> 149–59 (129 BC) | Title (<i>παῖάν καὶ ποθόδιον</i>) | pp. 34 ff. |
| R67 | Athenaios, <i>CA</i> 141–8 (see Bélis (1988)); 138 or 129 BC | Content | p. 35 |

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---------|-------|
| R68 | Anonymous παιᾶν
to Titus Flamininus
(174), <i>CA</i> 173 | Refrain | p. 57 |
| R69 | Cyrenaean παιᾶν, <i>SEC</i>
no. 80 | Refrain | p. 70 |
- Attestations*
- | | | | |
|-----|--|--|-------------|
| R70 | Alexinus of Elis,
παιᾶν to Craterus of
Macedon | Athen. 696 E = Hermippus,
48 Wehrli | p. 57 n. 80 |
| R71 | Anonymous παιᾶν
sung by Rhodians for
Ptolemy I | Athen. 696 F = Gorgon of
Rhodes, <i>FGrH</i> 515 F 19 | p. 57 n. 80 |
| R72 | Cleochares of Athens,
227 BC | <i>SIG</i> 450 (<i>FD</i> iii/2, no. 78)
says that he wrote a ποθόδιον
καὶ παιᾶν καὶ ὕμνος for the
Delphic Theoxenia | |

Post-Hellenistic*Poems and fragments*

- | | | | |
|------|------------------------------|---|-------|
| R73 | Hor. <i>Odes</i> 1. 2 | Function (see Cairns
(1971)) | p. 36 |
| R74* | Hor. <i>Carmen Saeculare</i> | παιᾶνες at Ludi Saeculares:
see oracle ap. Phlegon of
Tralles, <i>FGrH</i> 257 F 37 | p. 33 |

AELIUS ARISTIDES

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|-------------|
| R75 | 50. 31: παιᾶν begin-
ning φορμίγγων ἀνακτα
παιᾶνα κληῖσω (<i>GDRK</i>
S2. 3) | | p. 145 n. 6 |
| R76 | 40. 21, 50. 42: song
with refrain: ὦ Παιᾶν
Ἡρακλῆς Ἀσκληπιέ
(= <i>GDRK</i> S2. 1) | | pp. 135–6 |
| R77* | 49. 4: hexameter παιᾶν
to Sarapis (?) (<i>GDRK</i>
S2. 2) | | |
| R78 | 47. 73: παιᾶν on the
marriage of Coronis
and birth of Asclepius | | p. 38 n. 5 |

-
- | | | | |
|------|--|---------------------|-------|
| R79 | Sarapion of Hierapo-
lis, παιᾶν to Asclepius
(AD 175), Sarapion In-
scription, lines 41 ff. | | p. 42 |
| R80* | Soarchus, epigram
from Lebena in Crete,
<i>IC</i> i/17 no. 21 (1st
cent. AD) | Invocation of Paian | |

- R81* Syncretic epigram from Talmis in Nubia (Totti (1985), no. 41; Bernand (1969a), no. 167) Invocation of Paian
- R82* Syncretic epigram by Paccius from Talmis in Nubia, for Mandaulas (Totti (1985), no. 43; Bernand (1969a), no. 169) Invocation of Paian
- R83* Diophantos of Sphettos, hexameter coda in *IG* ii/2. 4514 (2nd cent. AD) Thanksgiving function p. 55 n. 74
- R84* Mesomedes, 4 (*Εἰς Φύσιν*) Name *Παιάν* in line 20, prayer function
- R85* Callistratus, *Eikon* 10 The ending p. 128

Testimonia

- R86-96 (?) *παιανῖαι* ('*παιάν*-singers') attested in Spartan inscriptions perhaps of the 1st cent. BC, some or all of whom may have composed *παιάνες*. Hippomedon, son of Nicander (*IG* v/1. 209. 23); Aristolas, Eudemidas (*IG* v/1. 210, col. 11. 47); Aristolas (again), Pratonikos son of Lysimachus (*IG* v/1. 212 col. 11. 45); Soteridas, Diocles, Eutuchus, Nanios, Arcadion, Lacon (*IG* v/1. 1314, side A, col. 11. 37 ff.)

Of uncertain date

- R97* *PMG* 922 = *POxy* 660, a lyric narrative describing the birth of a son (?) GH, *POxy* v. 61, thought this was from a *παιάν* because of references to *παιάνες* p. 61 n. 7
- R98 *παιάν* mentioning Alexandria: *PMG* 1035 Reference to a *παιάν* in the text
- R99 *GDRK* 52, identified by Schubart (1918) Presence of the word *παιάν*
- R100 Macedonicus of Amphipolis, *παιάν* to Asclepius, *CA* 138-9 Function, refrain p. 42
- R101 Fragment of *παιάν* to Asclepius, *IG* ii/2. 4494 Refrain
- R102 Fragment of *παιάν* to Asclepius, *IG* ii/2. 4544 The word *παιάν* in line 2
- R103* Hexameter *Paian* to Asclepius, the first poem in *IG* ii/2. 4533 Function p. 42

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|-------|
| R104 | Anapaestic poem to Telesphorus, third poem in <i>IG</i> ii/2. 4533 | | p. 42 |
| R105* | Hexameter poem to Telesphorus, fourth poem in <i>IG</i> ii/2. 4533 | Function | p. 42 |
| R106* | παῖάν to Asclepius | Function | |
| R107* | παῖάν to Asclepius and Apollo, <i>IG</i> iv/1(2). 135 | | |
| R108* | Acrostic epigram to Apollo, <i>AP</i> 9. 525 | Invocation of Paian at beginning and end | |
| R109* | <i>Hymnos</i> 8 in <i>PGM</i> 2. 244, addressed to Apollo | σὺν Παηγόνι | |
| R110 | <i>Hymnos</i> 10 in <i>PGM</i> 2. 244, addressed to Apollo | παῖάν-cry in line 2 | |
| R111 | <i>Hymnos</i> 11 in <i>PGM</i> 2. 245-6, addressed to Apollo and Helios | παῖάν-cry in line 3, lines 35-7 | |
| R112 | <i>Hymnos</i> 12 in <i>PGM</i> 2. 247, addressed to Apollo and Daphne | παῖάν-cries in lines 3, 18, 26 | |
| <i>Testimonia</i> | | | |
| R113 | Anonymous παῖάν to Agemon of Corinth | Athen. 696 F=Polemon fr. 76P | p. 49 |
| R114? | παῖάν to Athena used in the procession at the Panathenaea | Hel. <i>Aeth.</i> 1. 14 | p. 47 |

Concordance of Editions and Assignment Checklists

A. Rutherford–Maehler

| R | M | R | M | R | M |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| A ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> IX | D ₁₃ | Π ⁴ fr. 65 | S ₄ | <i>Pa.</i> XV |
| A ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> X (a) | D ₁₄ | Π ⁴ fr. 70 | S ₅ | <i>Pa.</i> XIII |
| A ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> X (b) | E ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIc (a) | S ₆ | <i>Pa.</i> XVII |
| A ₄ | Π ⁴ fr. 139 | E ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIc (b) | S ₇ | <i>Pa.</i> XVIII |
| A ₅ | Π ⁴ fr. 138 | F ₁ | fr. 61 | S ₈ | fr. 59 |
| A ₆ | Π ⁴ fr. 161 | F ₂ | fr. 58 | S ₉ | <i>Pa.</i> XXIIa–b |
| A ₇ | Π ⁴ fr. 81 | F ₃ | fr. 66 | Z ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> VII (c) |
| B ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> VIId | F ₄ | fr. 68 | Z ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> VII (e) |
| B ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> VIII | F ₅ | fr. 67 | Z ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> XXII (k) |
| B ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIla | F ₆ | fr. 70 | Z ₄ | Π ⁷ fr. 39 |
| B ₄ | Π ⁴ fr. 94 | F ₇ | fr. 69 | Z ₅ | Π ⁷ fr. 41 |
| B ₅ | Π ⁴ fr. 162 | F ₈ | fr. 62 | Z ₆ | Π ⁷ fr. 50 |
| B ₆ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIla (a) | F ₉ | fr. 64 | Z ₇ | Π ⁷ fr. 51 |
| B ₇ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIla (b) | F ₁₀ | fr. 65 | Z ₈ | Π ⁷ fr. 49 |
| B ₈ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIla (c) | F ₁₁ | — | Z _{9–10} | <i>Pa.</i> VIIf |
| B ₉ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIla (d) | G ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> XII | Z _{11–12} | Π ⁷ fr. 84 |
| B ₁₀ | Π ⁴ fr. 95 | G ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> XII (a) | Z ₁₃ | Π ⁷ fr. 68 |
| B ₁₁ | Π ⁴ fr. 144 | G ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> XVI | Z ₁₄ | Π ⁷ fr. 34 |
| C ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIa | G ₄ | fr. 60b | Z ₁₅ | <i>Pa.</i> XII (c) |
| C ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIb | G ₅ | <i>Pa.</i> VII (a) | Z ₁₆ | <i>Pa.</i> XII (d) |
| C ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIc | G ₆ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIb (a) 1–4 | Z ₁₇ | <i>Pa.</i> XII (e) |
| C ₄ | Π ⁴ fr. 22 | G ₇ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIb (a) 5 ff. | Z _{18–19} | <i>Pa.</i> XXII (c) |
| D ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> I | G ₈ | <i>Pa.</i> 140a | Z ₂₀ | <i>Pa.</i> XXII (d–e) |
| D ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> II | G ₉ | fr. 140b | Z ₂₁ | <i>Pa.</i> XXII (c) |
| D ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> III | G ₁₀ | <i>Pa.</i> 215 (a) | Z ₂₂ | fr. 60 (a) |
| D ₄ | <i>Pa.</i> IV | G ₁₁ | <i>Pa.</i> 215 (b) | Z _{23–4} | <i>Pa.</i> XXII (h) |
| D ₅ | <i>Pa.</i> V | H ₁ | fr. 54* | Z ₂₅ | <i>Pa.</i> XXII (i) |
| D ₆ | <i>Pa.</i> VI | H ₂ | fr. 55* | Z ₂₆ | Π ¹⁶ fr. 34 |
| D ₇ | <i>Pa.</i> VII | H ₃ | fr. 192 | Z ₂₇ | Π ¹⁶ fr. 94 |
| D ₈ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIc (d) | H ₄ | fr. 148 | Z ₂₈ | Π ¹⁹ fr. 3 |
| D ₉ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIc (c) | H ₅ | fr. 193 | Z ₂₉ | fr. 215 (c) |
| D ₁₀ | Π ⁴ fr. 46 | S ₁ | <i>Pa.</i> XX | Z ₃₀ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIlb (e) |
| D ₁₁ | Π ⁴ fr. 47 | S ₂ | <i>Pa.</i> XXI | Z ₃₁ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIlb (c) |
| D ₁₂ | Π ⁴ fr. 48 | S ₃ | <i>Pa.</i> XIV | Z ₃₂ | <i>Pa.</i> VIIlb (d) |

B. Maehler-Rutherford

| M | R | M | R | M | R |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Pa. I</i> | D ₁ | <i>Pa. VIIIb (a)</i> | G6 | <i>Pa. XXII (g)</i> | Z ₂₁ |
| <i>Pa. II</i> | D ₂ | <i>Pa. VIIIb (b)</i> | — | <i>Pa. XXII (h)</i> | Z ₂₃₋₄ |
| <i>Pa. III</i> | D ₃ | <i>Pa. VIIIb (c)</i> | Z ₃₆ | <i>Pa. XXII (i)</i> | Z ₂₅ |
| <i>Pa. IV</i> | D ₄ | <i>Pa. VIIIb (d)</i> | Z ₃₇ | <i>Pa. XXII (k)</i> | Z ₃ |
| <i>Pa. V</i> | D ₅ | <i>Pa. VIIIb (e)</i> | Z ₃₅ | fr. 54* | H ₁ |
| <i>Pa. VI</i> | D ₆ | <i>Pa. IX</i> | A ₁ | fr. 55* | H ₂ |
| <i>Pa. VII</i> | D ₇ | <i>Pa. X</i> | A ₂₋₃ | fr. 57 | — |
| <i>Pa. VII (a)</i> | G ₅ | <i>Pa. XII</i> | G ₁ | fr. 58 | F ₂ |
| <i>Pa. VII (b)</i> | — | <i>Pa. XII (a)</i> | G ₂ | fr. 59 | S ₈ |
| <i>Pa. VII (c)</i> | Z ₁ | <i>Pa. XII (b)</i> | — | fr. 60 (a) | Z ₂₂ |
| <i>Pa. VII (d)</i> | Z ₂ | <i>Pa. XII (c)</i> | Z ₁₅ | fr. 60 (b) | G ₄ |
| <i>Pa. VII (e)</i> | Z ₂ | <i>Pa. XII (d)</i> | Z ₁₆ | fr. 61 | F ₁ |
| <i>Pa. VII (f)</i> | Z ₉₋₁₀ | <i>Pa. XII (e)</i> | Z ₁₇ | fr. 62 | F ₈ |
| <i>Pa. VIIa</i> | C ₁ | <i>Pa. XIII (a)(b)</i> | S ₅ | fr. 64 | F ₉ |
| <i>Pa. VIIb</i> | C ₂ | (c)(g) | | fr. 65 | F ₁₀ |
| <i>Pa. VIIc</i> | C ₃ | <i>Pa. XIV</i> | S ₃ | fr. 66 | F ₃ |
| <i>Pa. VIIc (a)</i> | E ₁ | <i>Pa. XV</i> | S ₄ | fr. 67 | F ₅ |
| <i>Pa. VIIc (b)</i> | E ₂ | <i>Pa. XVI</i> | G ₃ | fr. 68 | F ₄ |
| <i>Pa. VIIc (c)</i> | D ₉ | <i>Pa. XVII(a)</i> | S ₆ | fr. 69 | F ₇ |
| <i>Pa. VIIc (d)</i> | D ₈ | <i>Pa. XVII(b)</i> | S ₆ | fr. 70 | F ₆ |
| <i>Pa. VIId</i> | B ₁ | <i>Pa. XVIII</i> | S ₇ | fr. 140 (a) | G ₈ |
| <i>Pa. VIII</i> | B ₂ | <i>Pa. XIX</i> | see G ₈ | fr. 140 (b) | G ₉ |
| <i>Pa. VIIIa</i> | B ₃ | <i>Pa. XX</i> | S ₁ | fr. 148 | H ₄ |
| <i>Pa. VIIIa (a)</i> | B ₆ | <i>Pa. XXI</i> | S ₂ | fr. 192 | H ₃ |
| <i>Pa. VIIIa (b)</i> | B ₇ | <i>Pa. XXII (a-b)</i> | S ₉ | fr. 193 | H ₅ |
| <i>Pa. VIIIa (c)</i> | B ₈ | <i>Pa. XXII (c)</i> | Z ₁₈₋₁₉ | fr. 215 (a-b) | G ₁₀₋₁₁ |
| <i>Pa. VIIIa (d)</i> | B ₉ | <i>Pa. XXII (d-e)</i> | Z ₂₁ | fr. 215 (c) | Z ₂₉ |

C. Rutherford-Turyn

| R | T | R | T | R | T |
|-------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------------|
| A1 | fr. 51 | D8 | fr. 57 | G4-7 | — |
| A2 | fr. 52 | D9 | fr. 56 | G8 | fr. 192 |
| A3 | fr. 61 | D10 | fr. 58 | G9 | fr. 222 |
| A4 | fr. 62 | D11 | fr. 59 | G10-11 | — |
| A5-6 | — | D12 | — | H1 | fr. 229 |
| B1 | fr. 49. 1-12 | E1 | fr. 55 | H2 | fr. 160 |
| B2 | fr. 49. 13 ff. | F1 | fr. 70 | H3 | fr. 228 |
| B3 | fr. 50 | F2 | fr. 67 | H4 | fr. 157 |
| B4-5 | — | F3 | fr. 77 | H5 | fr. 230 |
| B6 | fr. 60 | F4 | fr. 79 | S1-4 | — |
| B7-11 | — | F5 | fr. 78 | S5 | fr. 54 |
| C1 | — | F6 | Cf. fr. 71 | S6-7 | — |
| C2-3 | fr. 48 | F7 | fr. 80 | S8 | Cf. fr. 68 |
| D1 | fr. 41 | F8 | fr. 73 | S9 | — |
| D2 | fr. 42 | F9 | fr. 75 | Z1-5 | — |
| D3 | fr. 43 | F10 | fr. 81 | Z6 | fr. 64 |
| D4 | fr. 44 | F11 | — | Z7 | fr. 65 |
| D5 | fr. 45 | G1 | fr. 53 | Z8 | — |
| D6 | fr. 46 | G2 | — | Z9-10 | fr. 63 |
| D7 | fr. 47 | G3 | Cf. fr. 158 | Z11-30 | — |

D. Turyn-Rutherford

| T | R | T | R | T | R |
|----------------|------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| fr. 41 | D1 | fr. 57 | D8 | fr. 74 | — |
| fr. 42 | D2 | fr. 58 | D10 | fr. 75 | F9 |
| fr. 43 | D3 | fr. 59 | D11 | fr. 76 | Cf. F9 |
| fr. 44 | D4 | fr. 60 | B6 | fr. 77 | F3 |
| fr. 45 | D5 | fr. 61 | A3 | fr. 78 | F5 |
| fr. 46 | D6 | fr. 62 | A4 | fr. 79 | F4 |
| fr. 47 | D7 | fr. 63 | Z9-10 | fr. 80 | F7 |
| fr. 48 | C2-3 | fr. 64 | Z6 | fr. 81 | F10 |
| fr. 49. 1-12 | B1 | fr. 65 | Z7 | fr. 157 | H4 |
| fr. 49. 13 ff. | B2 | fr. 66 | — | fr. 158 | G3 |
| fr. 50 | B3 | fr. 67 | F2 | fr. 160 | H2 |
| fr. 51 | A1 | fr. 68 | Cf. S8 | fr. 192 | H8 |
| fr. 52 | A2 | fr. 69 | — | fr. 193 | H5 |
| fr. 53 | F1 | fr. 70 | F1 | fr. 222 | G9 |
| fr. 54 | S4 | fr. 71 | Cf. F6 | fr. 228 | H3 |
| fr. 55 | E1 | fr. 72 | — | fr. 229 | H1 |
| fr. 56 | D9 | fr. 73 | F8 | | |

Assignations of Fragments in Papyri

Fragments of Π^4

| Fr. | § | No. | Fr. | § | No. |
|-----------|--------|--------|------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| fr. 1-15 | A | D1-7 | fr. 91 | C | B9 |
| fr. 16-20 | B | C2 | fr. 92 | C | B7 |
| fr. 21-2 | B | C3, C4 | fr. 93 | C | — |
| fr. 23-5 | B | — | fr. 94 | C | B4 |
| fr. 26 | AB (?) | E1 | fr. 96 | C | B3 |
| fr. 27 | AB (?) | E2 | fr. 95 | C | B10 |
| fr. 28 | AB (?) | D9 | fr. 97-106 | C | — |
| fr. 29-32 | AB (?) | — | fr. 107 | C | B2 |
| fr. 33 | AB (?) | D8 | fr. 108 | D (once C) | $\Sigma D6$ (Pa. 6),
124 |
| fr. 34-45 | AB (?) | — | | | |
| fr. 46 | AB (?) | D10 | fr. 109-11 | C | — |
| fr. 47 | AB (?) | D11 | fr. 112 | A (once C) | D5. 4-5 |
| fr. 48 | AB (?) | D12 | fr. 113-25 | C | — |
| fr. 49-64 | AB (?) | — | fr. 126-8 | D | A1 |
| fr. 65 | AB (?) | D13 | fr. 129-31 | D | A2 |
| fr. 66-9 | ? | — | fr. 132-3 | D | — |
| fr. 70 | ? | D14 | fr. 134 | D | A3 |
| fr. 71-80 | ? | — | fr. 135-7 | D | — |
| fr. 81 | CD (?) | A7 | fr. 138 | D | A5 |
| fr. 82 | C | B2-3 | fr. 139 | D | A4 |
| fr. 84 | C | B2 | fr. 140 | CD | — |
| fr. 85 | C | — | fr. 143 | C | B2. 116 ff. |
| fr. 86 | C | B6 | fr. 144 | C (?) | B11 |
| fr. 87 | C | B2 | fr. 145-7 | CD | — |
| fr. 88 | C | B8 | fr. 148-60 | CD | — |
| fr. 89 | C | — | fr. 161 | D? | A6 |
| fr. 90 | C | B2 | fr. 162 | C? | B5 |

Some papyri contribute to only one song, or to two contiguous songs ($\Pi^6 = B2. 1-20$; $\Pi^8 = S5$; $\Pi^{11} = G8-9$). But some papyri (Π^3 , Π^7 , Π^{26} , Π^{28} , Π^{29} , Π^{30}) contribute to a number of songs, as follows:

Fragments of Π^5

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------------|------------|----|--------------|----|
| fr. I'-VI' | D6. 144 ff. | fr. VII' | F5 | fr. IX' | Z1 |
| fr. VI' | D7 | fr. X', X' | Z2 | fr. XI'-XII' | D6 |

Fragments of Π⁷

| | | | | | |
|---------|------|----------|-------|-----------|--------|
| fr. 1-4 | G1 | fr. 39 | Z4 | fr. 65 | S3 |
| fr. 6 | S5 | fr. 41 | Z5 | fr. 68 | Z17 |
| fr. 16 | D6 | fr. 43-4 | G2 | fr. 69 | S4 |
| fr. 17 | G1 | fr. 46 | Z15 | fr. 74 | G2 |
| fr. 24 | S2 | fr. 47 | Z9-10 | fr. 83 | S4 |
| fr. 30 | S3-4 | fr. 48 | Z16 | fr. 84 | Z11-12 |
| fr. 31 | S1 | fr. 49 | Z8 | fr. 139 | S2 |
| fr. 34 | Z13 | fr. 50 | Z6 | fr. Berol | Z5 |
| fr. 37 | G2 | fr. 51 | Z7 | | |
| fr. 38 | Z14 | fr. 60 | D6 | | |

Fragments of Π^{7}*

| | | | | | |
|---------|------------|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| fr. 1-2 | G1 | fr. 11 | G2 | fr. 15 | D6 |
| fr. 3 | cf. p. 259 | fr. 13 | Z15 | fr. 16 | Z17 |
| fr. 8 | S3-4 | fr. 14 | Z16 | | |

Fragments of Π¹⁶

| | | | | | |
|----------|--------|------------|--------|------------|-----|
| fr. 6-7 | S6-7 | fr. 34 | Z30 | fr. 94 | Z27 |
| fr. 10 | D7 (?) | fr. 39, 55 | S9 | fr. 96A, B | S9 |
| fr. 14 | C1-2 | fr. 65 | Z18-19 | fr. 97 | G8 |
| fr. 16 | G8 (?) | fr. 75 | Z20 | fr. 105 | Z25 |
| fr. 22-3 | B2 | fr. 79-80 | Z21 | fr. 107 | F3 |
| fr. 29 | B2 | fr. 86 | Z23-4 | | |
| fr. 32 | S1-2 | fr. 87 | Z25 | | |

Fragments of Π²⁸

| | | | | | |
|-------|------|-------|----|-------|----|
| fr. 1 | B1-2 | fr. 2 | B2 | fr. 3 | G3 |
|-------|------|-------|----|-------|----|

Fragments of Π²⁹

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------|-----|
| fr. 1 | S3-4 | fr. 3 | Z28 |
|-------|------|-------|-----|

Fragments of Π³⁸

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----|---------|-----|-------|-----|
| fr. 1 | G10 | fr. 2-3 | G11 | fr. 7 | Z25 |
|-------|-----|---------|-----|-------|-----|

Fragments of Π⁴⁵

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------|------------|---------|-------------|-----|
| fr. 1 | G6-7 | fr. 3-4 | Z31-2 | fr. 5, 2-6 | B2, 1-4 | fr. 6 (a-b) | Z30 |
|-------|------|---------|-------|------------|---------|-------------|-----|

Bibliography

- ABERT, H. (1899), *Die Lehre vom Ethos in der griechischen Musik* (Leipzig).
- ADAMI, F. (1900), *De Poetis Scaenicis Graecis Hymnorum Sacrorum Imitatoribus* (Philologische Jahrbücher, supp. 26: Leipzig), 237 ff.
- ADLER, A. (1967–71), *Suidas* (Lexicographi Graeci, 1; 5 vols.; Leipzig).
- AHL, F. (1982), 'Amber, Avallon and Apollo's Singing Swan', *AJP* 103: 373–411.
- ALEXIOU, M. (1974), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge).
- ALFONSI, L. (1954), 'Il nuovo Alceo e Orazio', *Aegyptus*, 34: 215–19.
- ALLEN, R. E. (1971), 'Attalos I and Aegina', *BSA* 66: 1–12.
- ALLEN, T. W. (1912), *Homeri Opera* (Oxford).
- HALLIDAY, W. R., and SIKES, E. E. (1936), *The Homeric Hymns*² (Oxford).
- ALSTER, B. (1985), 'Geštianna as Singer and the Chorus of Uruk and Zabalam: UET 6/1 22', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 27: 219–28.
- ALY, W. (1908), *Der kretische Apollonkult* (Leipzig).
- AMANDRY, P. (1939), 'Convention religieuse conclue entre Delphes et Skiathos', *BCH* 63: 183–219.
- (1944–5), 'Note sur la convention Delphes–Skiathos', *BCH* 68–9: 411–16.
- (1971), 'Collection Paul Canellopoulos (1)', *BCH* 95: 585–626.
- AMET, P. (1960), 'Le Temple Ailé', *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 54: 1–10.
- ANDERSON, W. D. (1966), *Ethos and Education in Greek Music* (Harvard).
- ANDREWES, A. (1961), 'Phratries in Homer', *Hermes*, 89: 129–40.
- ARRIGHETTI, G. (1987), 'I problemi dell'esegesi pindarica fra originalità e tradizione: La Nemea VII', in *Filologia e forme letterarie: Studi offerti a F. Della Corte* (Urbino).
- ASHERI, D. (1990), 'Herodotus on Thracian Society and History', in *Hérodote et les peuples non-grecs* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt, 35; Geneva), 131–63.
- ASPER, M. (1997), *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Hermes Einzelschriften, 75).
- ASSMANN, J. (1975), *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete* (Zurich).
- AUBERSON, P. (1974), 'La reconstitution du Daphnéphoréion d'Érétrie', *AntK* 17: 60–8.

- and SCHEFOLD, K. (1972), *Führer durch Eretria* (Berne).
- AUCHER, J. B. (1822), *Philo Judaeus. Sermones Tres Hactenus Inediti, Arm. et lat.* (Venice).
- AUSFELD, C. (1903), *De Graecis Precationibus Quaestiones* (Leipzig).
- AUSTIN, C. (1968), *Nova Fragmenta Euripidis in Papyris Reperta* (Berlin).
- AVAGIANOU, A. (1991), *Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion* (European University Studies, ser. XV vol. 54; Berne).
- AVERBECK, R. E. (1987), *A Preliminary Study of Ritual and Structure in the Cylinders of Gudea* (diss. Dropsie College).
- AX, W. (1932), 'Die Parodos des Oedipus Tyrannos', *Hermes*, 67: 413–37.
- BACK, F. (1883), *De Graecorum Caerimoniis in Quibus Homines Deorum Vice Fungebantur* (Berlin).
- BADENSTEINER, E. (1891), 'Über choregische Weihinschriften', *Commentationes Philologicae* (Munich).
- BADIAN, E. (1981), 'The Deification of Alexander the Great', in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honour of Charles F. Edson* (Thessalonika), 27–71.
- BAGNALL, R. S., FRIER, B., and RUTHERFORD, I. C. (1997), *The Census Register of P.Oxy. 984: The Reverse of Pindar's Paeans* (Pap. Brux. 29; Brussels).
- BAIN, D. M. (1984), 'Female Speech in Menander', *Antichthon*, 18: 24–42.
- BAKKER, W. F. (1966), *The Greek Imperative* (Amsterdam).
- BALZER, J. M. (1968), 'The Early Silver Coinage of Teos', *SNR* 47: 5–51.
- BARIGAZZI, A. (1966), *Favorinus: Opera* (Florence).
- BARKER, A. (1984), *Greek Musical Writings*, i (Cambridge).
- BARNER, W. (1971), 'Die Monodie', in Jens, 277–320.
- BARRETT, W. S. (1954), 'Bacchylides, Asine and Apollo Pythaieus', *Hermes*, 82: 421–44.
- BARRON, J. P. (1969), 'Ibycus and Polycrates', *BICS* 16: 119–49.
- (1984), 'Ibycus: Gorgias and Other Poems', *BICS* 31: 13–24.
- BAUNACK, J. (1886), *Studien auf dem Gebiete der griechischen und arischen Sprachen*, 3/1 (Leipzig).
- BECHTEL, F. (1917), *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle).
- BECKER, O. (1937), *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Hermes Einzelschriften, 4; Berlin).
- BEKKER, I. (1814–21), *Anecdota Graeca* (3 vols.; Berlin).
- BÉLIS, A. (1988), 'A proposito degli "Inni delfici" ad Apollo', in B. Gentili and R. Pretagostini, *La musica in Grecia* (Rome), 205–18.
- BENNETT, E. L., and OLIVIER, J.-P. (1973), *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed* (Incunabula Graeca, 51; Rome).
- BÉQUIGNON, Y. (1944), *La Vallée du Spercheios* (Bibl. Éc. Fr. 146; Paris).
- BÉRARD, C. (1971), 'Architecture érétrienne et mythologie delphique: Le Daphnephoréion', *AntK* 14: 59–73.

- BERGK: see *PLG* in the Abbreviations.
- BERGQUIST, B. (1973), *Herakles on Thasos: The Archaeological, Literary and Epigraphical Evidence for the Sanctuary, Status and Cult Reconsidered* (Uppsala).
- BERNABÉ, A. (1987), *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta*, I (Leipzig).
- BERNAL, M. (1987), *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*, i. *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985* (New Brunswick).
- (1991), *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*, ii. *The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence* (New Brunswick).
- BERNARD, É. (1969a), *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: Recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des grecs en Égypte* (Paris).
- (1969b), *Les Inscriptions grecques et latines de Philae* (Paris).
- BEST, J. (1969), *Thracian Peltasts* (Groningen).
- BETHE, E. (1929), *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*¹, ii/2. *Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- BILABEL, F. (1920), *Die ionische Kolonisation* (Philologus, supp. 14; Leipzig).
- BILL, C. P. (1901), 'Notes on the Greek *Θεωρός* and *Θεωρία*', *TAPA* 32: 196-204.
- BING, P. (1984), 'Callimachus' Cows: A Riddling Recusatio', *ZPE* 54: 1-8.
- (1988), *The Well-read Muse* (Hypomnemata, 90; Göttingen).
- BISI, A. M. (1985), 'Origine e diffusione del culto cirenaico di Zeus Ammon', in G. Barker, J. Lloyd, and J. Reynolds (eds.), *Cyrenaica in Antiquity* (*BAR* 236; Oxford), 307-17.
- BLASS, F. (1869), 'Pindaros' Hyporchem auf die Sonnenfinsternis', *JPh* 99: 387-90.
- (1899), *Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem* (Leipzig).
- (1906), 'Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen', *APF* 3: 257-99.
- (1917), *Hyperides* (Leipzig).
- BLECH, M. (1982), *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (Berlin).
- BODSON, L. (1978), *Τερά ζῶα: Contribution à l'étude de la place de l'animal dans la religion grecque antique* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Mémoires de la Classe de Lettres, 63.2; Brussels).
- BOECKH, A. (1811-19), *Pindari Opera Quae Supersunt* (Leipzig).
- (1858-74), *Kleine Schriften* (7 vols.; Leipzig).
- BOETHIUS, A. (1918), *Die Pythais: Studien zur Geschichte der Verbindungen zwischen Athen und Delphi* (diss. Uppsala).
- BOISACQ, É. (1916), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris).
- BOLL, F. (1909), 'Finsternisse', *RE* 12: 2329-64.
- BÖLTE, F. (1929), 'Zu Lakonischen Festen', *RM* 78: 124-43.

- BÖMER, F. (1969-86), *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen* (7 vols.; Heidelberg).
- BONA, G. (1988), *Pindaro, I peani: Testo, traduzione, scoli e commento* (Cuneo).
- BOND, G. (1963), *Euripides: Hypsipyle* (Oxford).
- BONNEAUX, D. (1964), *La Crue du Nil* (Paris).
- BORGEAUD, P. (1988), *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*, trans. K. Atlass and J. Redfield (Chicago).
- BORNEMANN, L. (1928), 'Pindar (1903-1927) und Bakchylides (1908 ff.)', *JFKA* 216: 131-86.
- BORTHWICK, K. (1967), 'Limbed Reeds in Theocritus, Aristophanes and Propertius', *CQ* 17: 110-12.
- BOTTIN, C. (1930-1), 'Étude sur la chorégie dithyrambique en attique jusqu'à l'époque de Demetrius de Phalère (308 avant J.C.)', *Rev. belg.* 9: 749-82; 10: 1-32; 10: 463-93.
- BOUSQUET, J. (1940-1), 'Inscriptions de Delphes II', *BCH* 64-5: 76-120.
- BOWIE, E. L. (1986), 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106: 13-35.
- BOWRA, C. M. (1935), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Oxford).
- (1938), 'Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue', *CQ* 32: 182-9 = Bowra (1953), 138-50.
- (1947), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*¹ (Oxford).
- (1953), *Problems in Greek Poetry* (Oxford).
- (1958), 'A Prayer to the Fates', *CQ* 8: 231-40.
- (1961a), *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford).
- (1961b), *Primitive Song* (London).
- (1963a), 'Two Lines of Eumelus', *CQ* 13: 145-53 = Bowra (1970), 46-53.
- (1963b), 'Arion and the Dolphin', *MH* 20: 121-31 = Bowra (1970), 164-81.
- (1964), *Pindar* (Oxford).
- (1970), *On Greek Margins* (Oxford).
- BRASWELL, B. K. (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin and New York).
- BREASTED, J. H. (1912), *The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (Philadelphia).
- BRELICH, A. (1961), *Guerre, agoni e culti nella Grecia arcaica* (Bonn).
- (1969), *Paides e Parthenoi* (Rome).
- BREMER, D. (1976), *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung: Interpretation zur Vorgeschichte der Lichtmetaphysik* (Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte, supp. 1; Bonn).
- BREMER, J. M. (1981), 'Greek Hymns', in H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope*

- and Worship: *Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Leiden), 193–215.
- VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP, A. MARIA, and SLINGS, S. R. (1987), *Some Recently Found Greek Poems* (Mnesmosyne supp. 99; Leiden).
- BRINKMANN, A. (1905), 'Lückenbüsser', *RM* 60: 159–60.
- BROWN, E. L. (1977), 'The Divine Name Pan', *TAPA* 107: 57–61.
- BRUCHMANN, G. F. H. (1893), *Epitheta Deorum Quae apud Poetas Graecos Leguntur* (Leipzig) [supp. to Roscher (1884)].
- BRUIT, L. (1984), 'Sacrifices à Delphes: Sur deux figures d'Apollon', *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 201: 339–67.
- (1990), 'The Meal at the Hyakinthia: Ritual Consumption and Offering', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica* (Oxford), 162–74.
- BRUNEAU, P. (1970), *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Bibliothèque de l'École Française d'Athènes et de Rome, 217; Paris).
- and DUCAT, J. (1983), *Guide de Délos* (Paris).
- BRUNEL, J. (1939), *L'Aspect verbal et l'emploi de préverbes en grec* (Paris).
- BUCHHOLZ, K. (1912), *De Horatio Hymnographo* (diss. Königsberg).
- BULLOCH, A. W. (1985), *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge).
- BUNDY, E. L. (1962), 'Studia Pindarica, I–II: The Eleventh Olympian Ode, The First Isthmian Ode', *UCPCPh* 18: 1–92; repr. as *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1986).
- BURIAN, P. (1986), 'Zeus Soter Tritos and Some Triads in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *AJP* 107: 332–42.
- BURKERT, W. (1967), 'Urgeschichte der Technik im Spiegel antiker Religion', *Technikgeschichte*, 34: 289–99.
- (1972), *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, trans. E. L. Minar, jun. (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (1975a), 'Rešep-Figuren, Apollon von Amyklai und die "Erfindung" des Opfers auf Cypern', *Grazer Beiträge* 4: 51–79.
- (1975b), 'Apollon und Apella', *RM* 118: 1–21.
- (1979), *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley).
- (1983), *Homo Necans*, trans. P. Bing (London).
- (1985), *Greek Religion*, trans. J. Raffan (Oxford).
- (1992), *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, trans. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert (Harvard).
- BURNETT, A. P. (1970), 'Pentheus and Dionysus: Host and Guest', *CP* 65: 15–29.
- (1983), *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London).
- (1985), *The Art of Bacchylides* (Harvard).
- (1989), 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CP* 84: 283–93.

- BURROWS, E. (1935), 'Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion', in S. H. Hooke (ed.), *The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World* (London), 43-70.
- BURTON, R. W. B. (1980), *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies* (Oxford).
- CAIRNS, F. (1971), 'Horace, Odes 1. 2', *Eranos*, 69: 68-88.
- (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- (1992), 'Propertius 4. 9: "Hercules Exclusus" and the Dimensions of Genre', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Interpretation of Roman Poetry: Empiricism or Hermeneutics?* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 67; Frankfurt), 65-95.
- CALAME, C. (1974), 'Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque', *QUCC* 17: 113-28.
- (1977a), *Les Chœurs des jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* (2 vols.; Rome).
- (ed.) (1977b), *Rito e poesia corale in Grecia: Guida storica e critica* (Rome).
- (1983), *Alcman: Introduction, texte critique, témoignages* (Rome).
- (1993), 'Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*', in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993), 37-55.
- CALDER, W. (1977), 'Pindar, *Paean* 6. 102 (=139)', *AJP* 98: 350.
- CAMERON, A. (1993), *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford).
- (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton).
- CANNATÀ FERA, M. (1980), 'Peani, ditirambi, treni in Pind. fr. 128c S.-M.', *GIF*, NS 11: 181-8.
- (1990), *Pindarus: Threnorum Fragmenta* (Rome).
- CAQUOT, A., SZNYCER, M., and HERDNER, A. (1974), *Textes ougaritiques, i. Mythes et légendes* (Paris).
- CARBONARA NADDEI, M. (1976), *Gli scolii greci al Gorgia di Platone* (Bologna).
- CAREY, C. (1989), 'The Performance of the Victory Ode', *AJP* 110: 545-65.
- (1992), review of Bona (1988), in *CR*, NS 41: 14-15.
- CARPENTER, T. H., and FARAONE, C. A. (eds.) (1993), *Masks of Dionysus* (Cornell).
- CASEVITZ, M. (1985), *Le Vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien* (Études et Commentaires, 97; Paris).
- CASKEY, M. E. (1986), *Keos II: The Temple at Ayia Irini, i. Statues* (Princeton).
- CASSIO, A. C. (1972), 'Pind. *Pae.* 4 (fr. 52d Sn.), 21-24', *ASNP* 2: 469-71.
- CÀSSOLA, F. (1954), 'La leggenda di Anio e la preistoria delia', *PP* 9: 345-67.
- (1975), *Inni omerici* (Milan).

- CAZZANIGA, I. (1970), 'Due contributi filologici (1). L'elenco degli scritti pindarici in Orazio c. IV. 2, ed in *POxy.* 2438', *SCO* 19: 1-8.
- ČERNÝ, J. (1962), 'Egyptian Oracles', in R. A. Parker (ed.), *A Saite Oracular Papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum (Papyrus Brooklyn 47. 218. 3)* (Providence), 35-48.
- CERRI, G. (1991), 'Il significato di "sphregis" in Teognide e la salvaguardia dell'autenticità nel mondo antico', *Quaderni di storia*, 33: 21-40.
- CHADWICK, J., KILLEN, J. T., and OLIVIER, J.-P. (1974), *The Knossos Tablets: A Transliteration* (Cambridge).
- CHAILLEY, J. (1979), *La Musique grecque antique* (Paris).
- CHAMOUX, F. (1953), *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Bibl. Écol. Française d'Athènes et de Rome, 176; Paris).
- CHANDLER, H. W. (1881), *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation* (Oxford).
- CHANTRAINE, P. (1958-63), *Grammaire homérique*³ (Paris).
- CLARK, R. J. (1968), 'Trophonius and the Manner of his Revelation', *TAPA* 99: 63-75.
- CLASSEN, C. J. (1959), 'The Libyan God Ammon in Greece before 331 B.C.', *Historia*, 8: 349-55.
- CLAY, A. T. (ed.) (1923), *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, iv (New Haven).
- CLAY, J. STRAUSS (1989), *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton).
- CLIFFORD, R. J. (1972), *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- COLE, S. G. (1980), 'New Evidence for the Mysteries of Dionysus', *GRBS* 21: 223-38.
- (1993), 'Voices from beyond the Grave: Dionysus and the Dead', in Carpenter and Faraone (1993), 276-95.
- COLE, T. (1988), *Epiploke: Rhythmical Continuity and Poetic Structure in Greek Lyric* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- COLES, R. A. (1974), *A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus: The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros* (BICS supp. 32; London).
- COLONNA, A. (1951), *Himerius: Declamationes et Orationes* (Rome).
- CONSRUCH, M. (1906), *Hephaestionis Enchiridion* (Leipzig).
- COOK, A. B. (1914-40), *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* (3 vols.; Cambridge).
- CRAMER, J. A. (1839-41), *Anecdota Graeca e Codd. Manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Pariensis* (4 vols.; Oxford).
- CROENERT, W. (1908), review of *POxy* v, in *Literarische Zentralblätter*, 59: 19-24.
- CROISSANT, F. (1980), 'Les frontons du temple du iv^e siècle à Delphes: Premiers essais de restitution', *RA*: 172-9.

- CROMEY, R. D. (1978), 'Attic *Παιανία* and *Παιονίδαί*', *Glotta*, 56: 62-9.
- CRUSIUS, O. (1894), *Die delphischen Hymnen* (supp. to *Philologus*, 53; Göttingen).
- CUFFARI, G. (1983), *I riferimenti poetici di Imerio* (Palermo).
- CURTIVS, E. (1854), 'Zur Geschichte des Wegebaus bei den Griechen', *Abhandlungen der K. Preuß. Ak. der Wiss* (1854), 211-30; repr. in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1894), i. 1-116.
- DÄHNHARDT, O. (1894), *Scholia in Aeschyli Persas* (Leipzig).
- DALE, A. M. (1950), 'Stasimon and Hyporcheme', *Eranos*, 48: 14-20; repr. in *Collected Papers* (Cambridge, 1969), 34-40.
- (1954), *Euripides: Alcestis* (Oxford).
- D'ALESSIO, G. B. (1988a), 'Pindaro, Peana I (fr. 52a Sn.-M.), vv. 9-10', *ASNP* 18/4: 1441-6.
- (1988b): see D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988).
- (1991), 'Osservazioni e paralipomeni ad una nuova edizione dei frammenti di Pindaro', *RFIC* 119 (NS 69): 91-117.
- (1992a), 'Immigrati a Teo e ad Abdera (*SEG XXXI* 985; Pind. fr. 52b Sn.-M.)', *ZPE* 92: 73-80.
- (1992b), 'Due note su P. Oxy. 841 (Pindaro, Peani)', *ZPE* 92: 81-3.
- (1992c), 'Pindaro, peana VIIb (fr. 52h Sn.-M.)', *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress of Papyrology* (2 vols.; Cairo), i. 353-73.
- (1994a), 'First-person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39: 117-40.
- (1994b), review of Käppel (1992b), in *CR* 44: 62-7.
- (1995), 'Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (Parm. fr. 1 + 6 D.-K.; Pind. Ol. VI 22-7; pae. VIIb 10-20)', *SFIC* 13: 143-81.
- (1997), 'Pindar's Prosodia and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments', *ZPE* 118: 23-60.
- (1999), 'Su di un papiro berlinese di lirica corale (P.Berol. Inv. 13411 = Pind. fr. 52N S.M.)', *ZPE* 126: 15-25.
- and FERRARI, F. (1988), 'Pindaro, Peana 6, 175-183: Una ricostruzione', *SCO* 38: 159-79 [pp. 159-70 by D'Alessio, pp. 171-9 by Ferrari].
- DALLEY, STEPHANIE (1989), *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, The Flood, and Others* (Oxford).
- DALY, L. (1967), *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity* (Coll. Latomus, 90; Brussels).
- DANIEL, P. (1600), *P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolicorum Eclogae X Georgicorum Libri IIII Aeneidos Libri XII et in ea Mauri Servii Honoratii Grammatici Commentarii* (Paris).
- DANIELEWICZ, J. (1974), 'De Elementis Hymnicis in Sapphus Alcaei Anacreontisque Carminibus Quaestiones Selectae', *Eos*, 62: 23-33.
- (1980), 'Reguły rozpoczynania tekstu w melice greckiej', *Eos*, 68: 41-50.

- DANKA, R. D. (1971), 'Pierwotny Apollo, Pajan, Helios', *Meander*, 26: 153-67.
- DARCUS, S. M. (1979), 'A Person's Relation to *φρῆν* in Homer, Hesiod and the Greek Lyric Poets', *Glotta*, 57: 30-9.
- DAUX, G. (1936), *Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étoile jusqu'à la paix romaine* (Paris).
- (1942-3), 'En marge des inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 66-7: 137-49.
- DAVIES, M. (1988a), 'Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Handbook', *CQ* 38: 52-64.
- (1988b), 'The Cologne Alcaeus and Paradigmatic Allusiveness', *ZPE* 72: 39-42.
- DAVISON, J. A. (1934), 'The Authorship of the "Leucippides" Papyrus', *CR* 47: 205.
- (1968), *From Archilochus to Pindar: Papers on Greek Lyric Poetry of the Archaic Period* (London).
- DAVREUX, J. (1942), *La Légende de la prophétesse Cassandre* (Liège).
- DEAS, H. T. (1931), 'The Scholia Vetera to Pindar', *HSCP* 42: 1-78.
- DEFRADAS (1954), *Les Thèmes de la propagande delphique* (Paris).
- DE LA COSTE-MESSELIÈRE, P. (1946), 'Les Alcmeonides à Delphes', *BCH* 70: 271-87.
- (1949), 'Listes amphictyoniques du IV^e siècle', *BCH* 73: 201-47.
- DELATTE, A. C. (1915), *Études sur la littérature Pythagoricienne* (Paris).
- (1938), 'Note sur un fragment de Stésichore', *AC* 7: 23-9.
- DEL FABBRO, M. (1979), 'Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea', *Studi Papyrologica*, 18: 69-132.
- DELMOUSOU, D. P. (1988), 'The *Theoria* of Brauron', in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek Cult Practice* (Stockholm), 255-8.
- DEMAND, N. H. (1972), *Thebes in the Fifth Century: Heracles Resurgent* (London).
- DE MARTINO, S. (1989), *La danza nella cultura ittita* (Florence).
- DENEKEN, F. (1881), *De Theoxeniis* (Berlin).
- DENG, F. M. (1973), *The Dinga and their Songs* (Oxford).
- DENNISTON, J. D. (1954), *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford).
- and PAGE, D. L. (1957), *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Oxford).
- DEPEW, M. (1993), 'Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' Hymns', in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1993), 57-77.
- DE POLIGNAC, F. (1984), *La Naissance de la cité grecque* (Paris).
- DERENNE, E. (1930), *Les Procès d'impiété* (Paris).
- DES PLACES, É. (1962), 'Constructions grecques des mots à fonction double (*ἀπὸ κοινού*)', *RÉG* 75: 1-12.

- (1971) *Oracles chaldaïques: Avec un choix de commentaires anciens* (Paris).
- DETIENNE, M. (1985), 'Un polythéisme récrit: Entre Dionysos et Apollon. Mort et vie d' Orphée', *Archives de sciences sociales des religions*, 59: 65-75.
- (1986), 'L'Apollon meurtrier et les crimes de sang', *QUCC* 51 (NS 22): 7-17.
- (1989), *Dionysos at Large*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass.).
- DEUBNER, L. (1919), 'Paian', *NJKA* 22: 385-406; repr. in Deubner (1982), 204-25.
- (1932), *Attische Feste* (Berlin).
- (1941), 'Ololyge und Verwandtes', *APAW* 1: 1-28; repr. in Deubner (1982), 607-34.
- (1982), *Kleine Schriften zur klassischen Altertumskunde* (Königstein/Ts.).
- DEVEREUX, G. (1976), *Dreams in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- DI BENEDETTO, V. (1991), 'Pindaro, *Pae.* 7b, 11-4', *RFIC* 119 (NS 69): 164-76.
- DICKIE, M. W. (1993), review of Käppel (1992b), in *BMCR* 4/2 (1993), 100-5.
- (1997), 'Philostratus and Pindar's Eighth Paean', *BASP* 34: 11-20.
- DIEHL, E. (1940), '... Fuerunt ante Homerum Poetae', *RM* 89: 81-114.
- DIEHL, H. (1917), *Supplementum Lyricum: Neue Bruchstücke von Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho, Corinna, Pindar, Bacchylides* (Bonn).
- DIELS H., and SCHUBART, W. (1904), *Didymus' Kommentar zu Demosthenes* (Berlin).
- DIETRICH, B. C. (1975), 'The Dorian Hyacinthia: A Survival from the Bronze Age', *Kadmos*, 14: 133-42.
- DIGGLE, J. (1970), *Euripides: Phaethon* (Cambridge).
- DI MARCO, M. (1973-4), 'Osservazioni sull'iporchema', *Helikon*, 13-14: 326-48.
- DINDORF, W. (1838), *Aristophanis Comoediae* (4 vols.; Oxford).
- DINDORF, K. W. (1855), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (Oxford).
- (1877-88), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, i-ii (scholia in Venetus A); iii-iv (scholia in Venetus B), v-vi, ed. E. Maass (scholia Townleiana) (Oxford).
- DINDORF, W. (1829), *Aristides* (Leipzig).
- DISSEN, L. (1830), *Pindari Carmina Quae Supersunt cum Deperditorum Fragmentis Selectis* (Gotha and Erfurt).
- DODDS, E. R. (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley).
- DÖRIG, J. (1965), 'Kalamis-Studien', *JDAI* 80: 138-265.
- (1967), 'Lese Früchte', *Gestalt und Geschichte: Festschrift Karl Schefold*

- (Berne), 102–9 (II. 'Der Westgiebel des Apollontempels zu Delphi', 105–9).
- DOUGHERTY, C. (1992), 'When Rain Falls from the Clear Blue Sky: Riddles and Colonisation Oracles', *CA* 11: 28–44.
- (1994), 'Pindar's Second Paean or Civil Identity on Parade', *CP* 89: 205–18.
- DRERUP, H. (1952), 'Architektur und Toreutik in der griechischen Frühzeit', *MDAI* 5: 1–38.
- (1964), 'Griechische Architektur zur Zeit Homers', *AA* (supp. to *JDAI* 79), 180–219.
- (1986), 'Das sogenannte Daphnephoreion in Eretria', *Studien zur klassischen Archäologie für F. Hiller* (Saarbrücker St. zur Archäol. und alten Geschichte, 1; Saarbrücken), 3–21.
- DUCAT, J. (1964), 'Le Ptoion et l'histoire de la Béotie à l'époque archaïque', *RÉG* 77: 283–90.
- DUCHEMIN, J. (1955), *Pindare: Poète et prophète* (Paris).
- DUMEZIL, G. (1982), *Apollon sonore* (Paris).
- DUNKEL, G. (1978), 'Preverb Deletion in Indo-European?', *ZVS* 92: 14–26.
- DURANTE, M. (1971–4), *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca* (2 vols.; Incunabula Graeca, 50, 64; Rome).
- DÜRING, I. (1957), *Aristotle and the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Göteborg).
- DYCK, A. (1989), 'New Light on Greek Authors from Grammatical Texts', *Mus. Helv.* 46: 1–8.
- EASTERLING, P. E. (1982), *Sophocles: Trachiniae* (Cambridge).
- EBELING, E. (1931), *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (Berlin).
- EHRHARDT, N. (1983), *Milet und seine Kolonien: Vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen* (Frankfurt).
- EICHGRÜN, E. (1961), *Kallimachos und Apollonius* (Berlin).
- EISNER, R. (1972), 'The Temple at Ayia Irini', *GRBS* 13: 123–33.
- EITREM, S., and AMUNDSEN, L. (1956), 'Fragments from Speeches of Himerius', *CM* 17: 23–30.
- ELIADE, M. (1976), *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy* (Princeton).
- ELMSLEY, P. (1825), *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Septem* (Oxford).
- ENTRALGO, P. L. (1970), *The Therapy of the Word in Classical Antiquity*, trans. L. J. Rather and J. M. Sharp (New Haven).
- ERBSE, H. (1955), 'Zum Apollonhymnos des Kallimachos', *Hermes*, 83: 411–28; repr. in A. D. Skiadas (ed.), *Kallimachos* (Wege der Forschung, 206; Darmstadt, 1975), 276–300.
- (1960), *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Ilias-Scholien* (Zetemata, 24; Munich).

- (1969–83), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (7 vols.; Berlin).
- ESSER, D. (1976), *Untersuchungen zu den Odenschlüssen bei Horaz* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 77; Meisenheim am Glan).
- ESTEVEZ, V. A. (1981), 'Ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις: A Description of Bion's Refrain', *Maia*, 33: 35–42.
- EVELYN-WHITE, H. G. (1950), *Hesiod: Homeric Hymns and Homeric* (London and Cambridge).
- FABBRO, E. (1986), 'Considerazioni sul peana conviviale', *QFC* 5: 23–35.
- FAIRBANKS, A. (1900), *A Study of the Greek Paean* (Cornell).
- FAKHRI, A. (1973), *The Oases of Egypt*, i. *Siwa Oasis* (Cairo).
- FALTER, O. (1934), *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern* (Würzburg).
- FARAONE, C. A. (1985), 'Aeschylus' ἔμνος δέσμιος (*Eum.* 306) and Attic Judicial Tablets', *JHS* 105: 150–4.
- (1991), 'The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells', in C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford), 3–32.
- FÄRBER, H. (1936), *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (2 vols.; Munich).
- FARNELL, L. R. (1930–2), *The Works of Pindar, Translated with Literary and Critical Commentary* (3 vols.; London).
- FEHLING, D. (1969), *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin).
- (1971), *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodotos* (Berlin and New York); trans. *Herodotus and his Sources* (ARCA 109; Liverpool, 1984).
- FEHRLE, E. (1910), *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum* (Giessen).
- FENNO, J. B. (1995), 'Poets, Athletes and Heroes: Theban and Aeginetan Identity in Pindar's Aeginetan Odes' (diss. UCLA).
- FERRARI, F. (1988): see D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988).
- (1990), 'Restauri testuali a P. Yale 18 (Pindaro, fr. 140a e fr. 140b Maehler)', *Maia*, 42: 229–34.
- (1991a), 'Tre papiri pindarici: In margine ai fr. 52n (a), 94a, 94b, 169a Maehler', *RFIC* 119: 385–407.
- (1991b), 'Contributo al testo dei Ditirambi di Pindaro', *SIFC* 64: 3–8.
- (1992a), 'Per il testo dei Peani di Pindaro', *MD* 28: 143–52.
- (1992b), 'Pindaro, Fr. 215 (a), 4', *Maia*, 44: 227–31.
- (1992c), 'Dileggio e rispetto dei νόμιμα nel fr. 215M. di Pindaro', *Atti Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti Classe di Lettere, Filosofia e Belle Arti*, 67: 71–82.
- (1992d), 'La sigla ζη/ζ̄ nei papiri pindarici', *SCO* 42: 273–6.
- FEYEL, M. (1942–3), 'Nouvelles inscriptions d'Abdère et de Maronée', *BCH* 66–7: 176–99.

- FICK, A. (1894), *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt und systematisch geordnet*¹ (Göttingen).
- FIGUEIRA, T. J. (1981), *Aegina: Society and Politics* (New York).
- FILENI, M. G. (1987), *Senocrito di Locri e Pindaro* (Biblioteca di Quaderni di Cultura Classica, 2; Rome).
- FINLEY, J. H. (1951), 'The Date of *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7', *HSCP* 60: 61–80.
- FINNEGAN, R. (1970), *Oral Literature in Africa* (Oxford).
- FINNESTAD, R. B. (1985), *Image of the World and Symbol of the Creator: On the Cosmological and Iconographical Values of the Temple at Edfu* (Wiesbaden).
- FLOCK, W. (1908), *De Graecorum interpunctionibus* (Bonn).
- FLÜCKINGER-GUGGENHEIM, D. (1984), *Göttliche Gäste* (Berne).
- FOGELMARK, S. (1972), *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII* (Lund).
- FOLEY, H. P. (1985), *Ritual Irony: Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides* (Cornell).
- FONTENROSE, J. (1959), *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley).
- (1960), 'The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi', *UCPCA* 4/3: 191–266.
- (1978), *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operation* (Berlin).
- (1988), *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions* (Berkeley).
- FORBES, C. A. (1933), *Néoi: A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations* (American Philological Association Monographs, 2; Middletown, Conn.).
- FORSSMAN, B. (1966), *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars* (Klassische-philologische Studien, 33; Wiesbaden).
- FÖRSTEL, K. (1972), 'Zu Pindars achtem Paian', *RM* 115: 97–133.
- (1979), *Untersuchungen zum homerischen Apollonhymnus* (Bochum).
- FOWLER, A. (1982), *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- FOWLER, R. L. (1987), *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto).
- (1993), 'P. Oxy. XXVI 2442 fr. 29: A Citation of Euphoriion', *ZPE* 96: 15–16.
- FRACCAROLI, G. (1909), review of *POxy* v, in *RFIC* 37: 87–96.
- FRAENKEL, E. (1948), 'Umdeutungen von Flexionsformen usw.', *IF* 59: 121–65.
- (1950), *A Commentary on Aeschylus, Agamemnon* (Oxford).
- (1957), *Horace* (Oxford).
- (1959) 'Zu den Vögeln des Aristophanes', in H. Dahlmann and R.

- Merkelbach (eds.), *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik: Festschrift für G. Jachmann* (Cologne), 9–30; repr. in Fraenkel (1964), 427–51.
- (1964), *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (2 vols.: Rome).
- FRANCIS, E. D. (1972), 'Pindar fr. 104b Snell', *CQ* 22: 33–41.
- FRANCHI DE CAVALIERI, P. (1891), *Martirii di S. Teodoto e di S. Ariadne con un'appendice sul testo originale del martirio di S. Eleuterio* (Studi e testi, 6; Rome).
- FRÄNKEL, H. (1961), 'Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3', *Hermes*, 89: 385–97.
- (1968), *Noten zu den Argonautica des Apollonios* (Munich).
- FREIS, R. (1983), 'The Catalogue of Pindaric Genres in Horace *Ode* 4. 2', *CA* 2: 27–36.
- FRIEDLÄNDER, P. (1941), 'Plato *Phaedrus* 245a', *CP* 36: 51–2.
- FRIIS JOHANSEN, K. (1959), *Eine Dithyrambos-Aufführung* (Arkaeol. Kunsthist. Meddel. udg. af Det Danske Vidensk. Selskab 4.2; Copenhagen).
- and WHITTLE, E. W. (1980), *Aeschylus: The Suppliants* (3 vols.; Copenhagen).
- FRONING, H. (1971), *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen* (Beiträge zur Archäologie, 2; Würzburg).
- FÜHRER, R. (1967), *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der früh-griechischen Lyrik* (Zetemata, 44; Munich).
- (1976), 'Beiträge zur Metrik und Textkritik der griechischen Lyriker (IIa): Text und Kolometrie von Bakchylides' *Ἡῆροι* (c. 17)', *NGG* 5: 167–243.
- FURTWÄNGLER, F. (1882), 'Von Delos', *Archäologische Zeitung*, 40: 321–68.
- FUNGHI, M. S., and SAVORELLI, G. M. (1992), 'Lo scriba di Pindaro e le biblioteche di Ossirinco', *SCO* 42: 43–62.
- FURUMARK, A. (1954), 'Ägäischer Text in griechischer Sprache', *Eranos*, 52: 18–60.
- GAEDE, R. (1880), *Demetrii Scepsi Quae Supersunt* (diss. Greifswald).
- GAGÉ, J., *Apollon romain: Essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développemenet du 'ritus Graecus' à Rome des origines à Auguste* (Paris, 1955).
- GALIANO, M. F. (1950–1), 'Varia Graeca', *Humanitas*, 3: 301–22.
- GALINSKY, G. K. (1972), *The Herakles Theme* (Oxford).
- GALLAVOTTI, C. (1942), 'Studi sulla lirica greca (5): Nuovi carmi di Alceo da Ossirinco', *RFIC* 70 (NS 20): 161–81.
- (1962), 'Pindaro Hyporch. fr. 107ab', *RFIC* 90 (NS 40): 38–42.
- (1965), 'Echi di Alceo e di Menandro nei retori tardivi', *RFIC* 93 (NS 43): 135–46.
- (1979), 'Due note epigrafiche di morfologica greca', in B. Brogyanyi (ed.), *Studies in Diachronic, Synchronic and Typological Linguistics: Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi* (2 vols.; Amsterdam), i. 251–63.

- GALLO, I. (1968), *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro* (P.Oxy. 2438) (Salerno).
- GAMBERINI, L. (1979), *Plutarco: 'Della Musica'* (Florence).
- GANTZ, T. (1981), 'Divine Guilt in Aeschylus', *CQ* 31: 18-32.
- GARNER, R. (1990), *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London).
- GARROD, H. W. (1922), 'Simonides', *CQ* 16: 121-3.
- GARVIE, A. F. (1970), 'The Opening of the *Choephoroi*', *BICS* 17: 79-91.
- (1986), *Aeschylus: Choephoroi* (Oxford).
- GASPAR, C. (1900), *Essai de la chronologie pindarique* (Brussels).
- GELZER, T. (1985), 'Μοῦσα αὐθιγενής: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien', *MH* 42: 95-120.
- GENNARO, S. (1948), *L'ottavo peana di Pindaro* (Catania).
- GENTILI, B. (1979), 'Trittico Pindarico', *QUCC* 31 (NS 2): 7-33.
- (1981), 'L'effigie bifronte di Neottolemo nel sesto Peana e nella settima Nemea di Pindaro', in *Letterature comparate: Problemi e metodo. Studi in onore di E. Paratore* (Bologna), 103-9.
- GÉRARD-ROUSSEAU, M. (1968), *Les Mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniennes* (Rome).
- GERBER, D. (1969), *A Bibliography of Pindar: 1513-1966* (Case Western Reserve University).
- (1976), *Emendations in Pindar: 1513-1972* (Amsterdam).
- (1982), 'Bacchylides 17, 124-29', *ZPE* 49: 3-5.
- GIESEMAN, P. (1892), *De Metro Paenonico sive Cretico* (diss. Trebnitz).
- GILDERSLEEVE, B. L. (1908), 'Brief Mention', *AJP* 29: 113-25.
- (1909), 'Brief Mention', *AJP* 30: 105-13.
- GILL, G. (1974), 'Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice', *HTR* 67: 117-37.
- GINOUVÈS, R. (1962), *Βαλανευτική: Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris).
- GÖDECKEN, K. B. (1986), 'Beobachtungen und Funde an der heiligen Straße zwischen Milet und Didyma, 1984', *ZPE* 66: 217-53.
- GOLDHILL, S. (1987), 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology', *JHS* 107: 58-76.
- GORDON, C. H. (1949), *Ugaritic Literature: A Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts* (Rome).
- GÖRGEMANN, H. (1970), *Untersuchungen zu Plutarchs Dialog De Facie in Orbe Lunae* (Heidelberg).
- GOW, A. S. F., and PAGE, D. L. (1968), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge).
- and SCHOFIELD, A. F. (1953), *Nicander: The Poems and Poetical Fragments* (Cambridge).
- GRAF, F. (1974), 'Das Kollegium der Molpoi von Olbia', *MH* 31: 209-15.
- (1979), 'Apollon Delphinios', *MH* 36: 2-22.

- (1985), *Nordionische Kulte: Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia* (Rome).
- GRAINGER, J. G. (1990), *Seleukos Nikator* (London).
- GRANDOLINI, S. (1984–5), 'Il Peana IV di Pindaro (fr. 52d S.M.)', *Annali della facoltà della Università degli studi di Perugia*, 22/1: 45–64.
- GRIFFITH, J. GWYN (1960), 'The Flight of the Gods before Typhon: An Unrecognised Myth', *Hermes*, 88: 374–6.
- GRUPPE, O. (1897–1906), *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (2 vols.; Munich).
- GUARDUCCI, M. (1943–6), 'Creta e Delphi', *SMSR* 19–20: 85–114.
- GUHL, C. (1969), *Die Fragmente des alexandrischen Grammatikers Theon* (Hamburg).
- GUILLON, P. (1943), *Les Trépieds du Ptoion* (Paris).
- (1953), 'Sur un fragment de Pindare et un faux sens de Strabon: La retraite aux trois cimes du Ptoion', *BCH* 77: 377–87.
- GÜNTHER, H.-C. (1988), *Euripides: Iphigeneia Aulidensis* (Leipzig).
- HABICHT, C. (1970), *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*² (Zetemata, 14; Munich).
- HALDANE, J. A. (1963), 'A Paean in the Philoctetes', *CQ* 13: 53–6.
- (1965), 'Musical Themes and Imagery in Aeschylus', *JHS* 85: 33–41.
- (1968), 'Pindar and Pan, frs 95–100 Snell', *Phoenix*, 22: 18–31.
- HALLIDAY, W. R. (1928), *Plutarch's Greek Questions* (Oxford).
- HALLIWELL, F. S. (1989), 'Authorial Collaboration in the Athenian Comic Theatre', *GRBS* 30: 515–28.
- HALLO, W. W., and VAN DIJK, J. J. A. (1968), *The Exaltation of Inanna* (YNER 3; New Haven).
- HAMILTON, R. (1974), *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (The Hague).
- (1990), 'The Pindaric Dithyramb', *HSCP* 93: 211–22.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L., and GRIFFITH, G. T. (1979), *A History of Macedonia*, ii. 550–336 B.C. (Oxford).
- HAMPE, R. (1941), 'Zu Pindars Paian für Abdera', *Hermes*, 76: 136–42.
- (1967), *Kult der Winde in Athen und Kreta* (SBHAW; Heidelberg).
- HANFMANN, G. M. A. (1951), *The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks* (2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.).
- HARDER, M. A. (1990), 'Untrodden Paths: Where Do they Lead?', *HSCP* 93: 287–309.
- REGTUIT, R. F., and WAKKER, G. C. (eds.) (1993), *Callimachus* (Hellenistica Groningana, 1; Groningen).
- HARDIE, A. (1976), 'Horace Odes 1, 37 and Pindar Dithyramb 1', *PLLS* 2: 113–40.

- (1996), 'Pindar, Castalia and the Muses of Delphi (the Sixth Paean)', *PLLS* 9: 219–57.
- HARTUNG, J. A. (1855–6), *Pindar's Werke: Griechischer Text mit metrischer Übersetzung und prüfenden und erklärenden Anmerkungen* (4 vols.; Leipzig).
- (1855–7), *Die griechischen Lyriker* (Leipzig).
- HARVEY, A. E. (1955), 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry', *CQ* 5: 157–75.
- HASLAM, M. (1975), 'The Authenticity of Euripides *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles *Electra* 1', *GRBS* 16: 149–74.
- (1978), 'The Versification of the New Stesichorus', *GRBS* 19: 29–57.
- HASPERS, C. H. E. (1936), *Attic Black-figured Lekythoi* (Paris).
- HEAD, B. V. (1911), *Historia Nummorum* (Oxford).
- HEATH, M. (1988), 'Receiving the *Kṓmos*', *AJP* 109: 180–95.
- (1993), 'Ancient Interpretations of Pindar's *Nemean* 7', *PLLS* 7: 169–99.
- and LEFKOWITZ, M. (1991), 'Epinician Performance', *CP* 86: 173–91.
- HEBERDEY, R. (1904), 'Δαίτης: Ein Beitrag zum ephesischen Artemiskult', *JÖAI* 7: 210–15.
- HEIDENREICH, R. (1954–5), 'Agamedes in Delphi oder Mythos und Baukunst', *Zeitschrift der Friedr. Schiller-Universität, Jena*, 4: 49 ff.
- HEINIMANN, F. (1945), *Nomos und Physis* (Basle; repr. 1965).
- HEITSCH, H. (1960), 'Drei Helioshymnen', *Hermes*, 88: 139–58.
- HELCK, H. (1905), *De Cratetis Mallotae Studiis Criticis Quae ad Iliadem Spectant* (Leipzig).
- HELLMANN, M. C., and FRAISSE, R. (1979), *Exploration archéologique de Délos*, xxii. *Le Monument aux Hexagons et le portique des Naxiens* (Paris).
- HENDERSON, W. J. (1992), 'Pindar fr. 140b Snell–Maehler: The Chariot and the Dolphin', *Hermes*, 120: 148–58.
- HENRICHs, A. (1984), 'The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of Isis Aretalogies', *HSCP* 88: 139–58.
- (1985), '"Der Glaube der Hellenen": Religionsgeschichte als Glaubensbekenntnis und Kulturkritik', in W. Calder III, H. Flashar, and T. Lindken (eds.), *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren* (Darmstadt), 263–305.
- (1993), 'He Has God in Him: Human and Divine in Modern Perception of Dionysus', in Carpenter and Faraone (1993), 26–43.
- (1995), '"Why Should I Dance?": Choral Self-referentiality in Greek Tragedy', *Arion*, 3/1. *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture*, i (1994–5), 56–111.
- HERINGTON, C. J. (1985), *Poetry into Drama* (Berkeley).
- HERMANN, G. (1798–9): see Heyne (1798–9).
- (1845), *De Pindari ad Solem Deficientem Versibus* (Leipzig); repr. in *Opuscula*, viii (Leipzig, 1877), 75–90.

- HERRMANN, H.-V. (1959), *Omphalos* (Münster).
- HERRMANN, P. (1981), 'Teos and Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Ein neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae', *Chiron*, 11: 1-30.
- HEUBECK, A. (1987), 'Noch einmal zum Namen des Apollon', *Glotta*, 65: 179-82.
- HEYNE, C. G. (1798-9), *Pindari Carmina* (Göttingen); vol. iii/1 comprises an edition of the fragments by G. Hermann.
- HIGHBY, L. I. (1936), *The Erythraean Decree* (Klio supp. 36 (NS 23); Leipzig).
- HILGARD, A. (1901), *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* (Grammatici Graeci, 1/3; Leipzig).
- HILLER, E. (1886), 'Beiträge zur griechischen Litteraturgeschichte (4): Die Fragmente des Glaukos von Rhegion', *RM* 41: 398-436.
- HILLGRUBER, M. (1990), 'Zur Zeitbestimmung der Chrestomathie des Proklos', *RM* 133: 397-404.
- HOEKSTRA, A. (1962), 'The Absence of the Aeginetans', *Mnem.* NS 15: 1-14 (cf. Calame (1977b), 181-92).
- HÖFLER, A. (1935), *Der Sarapishymnus des Aelius Aristides* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 27; Tübingen).
- HOLDER, A. (1893), *Pomponi Porphyronis Commentum in Horatium Flaccum* (Innsbruck).
- HOLLIS, A. S. (1990), *Callimachus: Hecale* (Oxford).
- HOMBERT, M., and PRÉAUX, C. (1952), *Recherches sur le recensement dans l'Égypte romaine* (P. Bruxelles Inv. E. 7616) (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 5; Leiden).
- HOMMEL, H. (1980), *Der Gott Achilles* (SbHeidAW 11/14; Heidelberg).
- HOMOLLE, T. (1902), 'Monuments figurés de Delphes: Les frontons du temple d'Apollon II', *BCH* 26: 587-639.
- HOPE, N. (1986) *A Commentary on the Fourth and Ninth Paeans of Pindar* (diss. Oxford).
- HORN, E. (1883), *De Aristarchi Studiis Pindaricis* (Greifswald).
- HORN, W. (1970), *Gebete und Gebetsparodie in der Komödie des Aristophanes* (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprache und Kunstwissenschaft, 38; Nuremberg).
- HORNBLOWER, S. (1982), 'Thucydides, the Panionian Festival and the Ephesia (III 109)', *Historia*, 36: 241-5.
- HOSE, M. (1990), *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides* (2 vols.; Stuttgart).
- HOUSMAN, A. E. (1908), 'On the Paeans of Pindar', *CR* 22: 8-12; repr. in *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1972), ii. 763-9.
- HUBBARD, T. (1983), 'Pindar's *Harmonia*: Pythian 8. 67-9', *Mnem.* 36: 286-92.

- (1985), *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Mnem. supp. 85; Leiden).
- (1987a), 'Two Notes on the Myth of Aiaikos in Pindar', *GRBS* 28: 5–22.
- (1987b), 'Pindar and the Aeginetan Chorus: Nemean 3: 9–13', *Phoenix*, 41: 1–9.
- HUCHZERMAYER, H. (1931), *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit* (Emsdetten).
- HUNT, A. S. (1922): see the Abbreviations.
- HUNTER, R. L. (1983), *Eubulus: The Fragments* (Cambridge).
- (1986), 'Apollo and the Argonauts', *MH* 43: 50–60.
- HUXLEY, G. (1962), *Early Sparta* (London).
- (1965), 'Xenomedes of Keos', *GRBS* 6: 235–45.
- (1975), 'Cretan Paiawones', *GRBS* 16: 119–24.
- (1984), 'Teos in Pindar', in A. Boegehold *et al.* (eds.), *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his 80th Birthday* (GRBS Monographs, 10; Durham), 149–52.
- IRIGOIN, J. (1952), *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Ét. et Com. 13; Paris).
- ISAAC, B. H. (1986), *The Greek Settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian Conquest* (Leiden).
- JAN, K. (1895), *Musici Scriptores Graeci* (Leipzig).
- JANKO, R. (1982), *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge).
- JANSSEN, T. H. (1984), *Timotheus: Persae. A Commentary* (Amsterdam).
- JEANMAIRE, H. (1939), *Couroi et Courètes: Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique* (Lille).
- JEFF, R. C. (1905), *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge).
- JENS, W. (ed.) (1971), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich).
- JOCelyn, H. D. (1967), *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge).
- JÖHRENS, G. (1981), *Der Athenahymnus des Ailios Aristides* (Bonn).
- JONES, C. P. (1978), 'Three Foreigners in Attica', *Phoenix*, 32: 228–34.
- JONES, D. M. (1949), 'The Sleep of Philoctetes', *CR* 63: 83–5.
- JURENKA, H. (1912), 'Pindaros' neugefundener Paean für Abdera', *Philologus*, 71: 173–210.
- (1913), 'Zu Pindars sechstem Pään', *WS* 35: 382–3.
- KAHN, C. H. (1979), *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: An Edition of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- KAIBEL, G. (1878), *Epigrammata Graeca* (Berlin).
- KAMBYLIS, A. (1964), 'Anredeformen bei Pindar', in *Χάρις Κοσμή. I Βουπ-βέρη* (Athens), 95–199.
- (1965), *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (Heidelberg).
- (1966), 'Bemerkungen zu Pind. fr. 215 (a), 4 (Snell)', *Hermes*, 94: 238–43.

- KÄPPEL, L. (1992a), 'Pindar, Pac. fr. 67, 68, 69, 70 + *249b Sn.-M.', *RM* 135: 44-8.
- (1992b), *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, 37; Berlin).
- and KANNICHT, R. (1988), 'Noch einmal zur Frage "Dithyrambos oder Paian" im Bakchylideskommentar P.Oxy. 23. 2368', *ZPE* 73: 19-24.
- KAWERAU, G., and REHM, A. (1914), *Das Delphinion* (Milet, 3/1; Berlin).
- KEBRIC, R. B. (1983), *The Paintings in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi and their Historical Context* (Mnem. supp. 80; Leiden).
- KEEL, O. (1977), *Vögel als Boten* (Göttingen).
- KEIL, H. (1857), *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig).
- KELLER, O. (1877), *Rerum Naturalium Scriptores Graeci Minores* (Leipzig).
- KERÉNYI, K. (1976), *Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life* (Princeton).
- KEYSSNER, K. (1932), *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (Stuttgart).
- (1933), 'Die Hygieiahymnen des Aripbron und des Likymnius', *PW* 53: 1289-96.
- KIENZLE, E. (1936), *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (Basle).
- KILLEN, J. T., and OLIVIER, J.-P. (1971), *The Knossos Tablets*⁴ (Cambridge).
- KIRCHER, K. (1910), *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum* (Giesen).
- KLEIN, J. (1989), 'Building and Dedicatory Hymns in Sumerian Literature', *Acta Sumerologica*, 11: 27-67.
- KLEINKNECHT, H. (1937), *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 38; Stuttgart).
- KLINZ, A. (1933), *Ἱερὸς γάμος* (Halle).
- KNOKE, R. (1924), *De Hymnis Graecorum Tragicis* (diss. Göttingen).
- KOENEN, L. (1967), 'Eine Einladung zur Kline des Sarapis', *ZPE* 1: 121-6.
- (1969), 'Eine Hypothese der Auge des Euripides und tegeatische Plynterien', *ZPE* 4: 7-18.
- KRITZAS, C. (1992), 'Aspects de la vie politique et économique d'Argos au v^e siècle avant J.C.', *Polydipsion Argos* (BCH supp. 22; Paris), 231-40.
- KÖHNKEN, A. (1971), *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten* (Berlin).
- (1974), 'Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Role of the Pelops Story in O. 1', *CQ* 24: 199-206.
- KOLK, D. (1963), *Der pythische Apollohymnus als aitiologische Dichtung* (Meisenheim a. Glan).
- KOLLER, H. (1956), 'Das kitharodische Prooimion: Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *Philologus*, 100: 159-206.

- KÖNIG, A. (1970), *Die Aeneis und die griechische Tragödie: Studien zur Imitations-Technik Vergils* (Berlin).
- KÖRTE, A. (1913), 'Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen (Nr. 366-425)', *APF* 5: 531.
- (1918), 'Bacchylidea', *Hermes*, 53: 113-47.
- (1923), 'Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen', *APF* 7: 114-60.
- KORZENIEWSKI, D. (1968), *Griechische Metrik*¹ (Darmstadt).
- KOSTER, W. J. W. (1953), *Traité de métrique grecque* (Leiden; repr. 1962).
- (1967), 'De Quibusdam Colis Dactylicis deque Ceteris Metriis Pindari Pae. IV et IX', *Mnem.* 20: 396-402.
- KÖTTING, B. (1950), *Peregrinatio Religiosa: Wallfahrten in der Antike und das Pilgerwesen in der alten Kirche* (Regensburg and Münster).
- KRANZ, W. (1933), *Stasimon: Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin).
- (1961), 'Sphragis: Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotiv antiker Dichtung', *RM* 104: 3-46, 97-124; repr. in *Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrem Nachwirken* (Heidelberg, 1967), 27-78.
- KRAPPE, A. H. (1942), 'Ἀπόλλων Κύκνος', *CP* 37: 353-70.
- KRAUS, T. (1960), *Hekate: Studien zum Wesen und Bild der Göttin in Kleinasien und Griechenland* (Heidelberg).
- KRECHER, J. (1966), *Sumerische Kultlyrik* (Wiesbaden).
- KRISCHER, T. (1965), 'Pindars Rhapsodengedicht (Zu Nem. 2)', *WS* 78: 32-9.
- KRUMMEN, E. (1990), *Pyrros Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3) (Berlin and New York).
- KÜHNER, R., and GERTH, B. (1890-1905), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (2 vols.; Hanover).
- KUHLMANN, K. P. (1988), *Das Ammoneion: Archäologie, Geschichte und Kultpraxis des Orakels von Siwa* (Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo, 75).
- KURKE, L. (1988), 'The Poet's Pentathlon: Genre in Pindar's First Isthmian', *GRBS* 29: 97-113.
- KUTSCHER, R. (1975), *Oh Angry Sea (a-ab-ba hu-luh-ha): The History of a Sumerian Congregational Lament* (New Haven).
- LAAGER, J. (1957), *Geburt und Kindheit des Gottes in der griechischen Mythologie* (Winterthur).
- LAPALUS, E. (1947), *Le Fronton sculpté en Grèce des origines à la fin du 1^{er} siècle: Étude sur les origines, l'évolution, la technique et les thèmes de décor tympanal* (Paris).
- LA PENNA, A. (1957), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis* (Florence).

- LATACZ, J. (1966), *Zur Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg).
- LAUM, B. (1928), *Das alexandrische Akzentuationssystem* (Paderborn).
- LAVECCHIA, S. (1994), 'Il "Secondo Dittirambo" di Pindaro e i culti Tebani', *SCO* 44: 33-93.
- LAWLER, L. B. (1964), *The Dance in Ancient Greece* (London).
- LEBRUN, R. (1980), *Hymnes et prières hittites* (Homo Religiosus, 4; Louvain-la-Neuve).
- LEFKOWITZ, M. (1963), 'τῷ καὶ ἐγώ: The First Person in Pindar', *HSCP* 67: 177-253; repr. in Lefkowitz (1991), 1-71.
- (1975), 'The Influential Fictions in the Scholia to Pindar's *Pythian* 8', *CP* 70: 173-85; repr. in Lefkowitz (1991), 72-88.
- (1981), *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London and Baltimore).
- (1985), 'The Pindar Scholia', *AJP* 106: 269-82; repr. in Lefkowitz (1991), 147-160.
- (1988), 'Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?', *AJP* 109: 1-11; repr. in Lefkowitz (1991), 191-202.
- (1991), *First-person Fictions* (Oxford).
- LEHNUS, L. (1980), *L'inno a Pan di Pindaro* ('Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell'Antichità, 64; Milan).
- LEHRS, K. (1865), *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis* (Leipzig).
- LENTZ, A. (1879), *Herodian* (Leipzig).
- LEONE, A. (1976), 'La "onciale ogivale" dalle origini alla decadenza', *Studia Papyrologica*, 15: 141-9.
- LÉVÊQUE, P. (1973), 'Colonisation grecque et syncrétisme', in *Les Syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine: Colloque de Strasbourg (9-11 juin 1971)* (Paris), 43-66.
- (1975), 'Le syncrétisme créto-mycénien', in F. Dunand and P. Lévêque (eds.), *Les Syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité: Colloque de Besançon (22-23 octobre 1973)* (EPRO 46; Leiden), 19-73.
- LEWIS, D. (1962), 'The Federal Constitution of Keos', *ABSA* 57: 1-4.
- LEWY, H. (1977), *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* (Paris).
- LICHTHEIM, M. (1980), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings* (Berkeley).
- LIEBERG, G. (1990), 'Die Figur des handelnden Dichters bei Himerios', *RM* 133: 180-5.
- LINFORTH, I. M. (1931), 'Two Notes on the Legend of Orpheus', *TAPA* 62: 11-17.
- LIPÍŃSKI, E. (1973), 'Eshmun, "Healer"', *AION*, 33: 161-83.
- LIVREA, E. (1989), 'POxy. 2463: Lycophron and Callimachus', *CQ* 39: 141-7.
- LLOYD, A. B. (1976), *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 1-98* (Leiden).
- LLOYD-JONES, H. (1971), *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley).

- (1973), 'Modern Interpretations of Pindar: The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes', *JHS* 93: 109–37; repr. in Lloyd-Jones (1990), 110–53.
- (1990), *The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- (1993), 'Two Conjectures on Pindar's Fourth Paean (50–3)', *ZPE* 95: 1–5.
- LOBEL, E. (1925), *Σαπφούς Μέλῃ* (Oxford).
- (1961), *POxy* xxvi.
- LOEFFLER, I. (1963), *Die Melampodie: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des Inhalts* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 7; Meisenheim a. Glan).
- LONGONI, F. (1976), 'Nota sulla storia del ditirambo', *Acme*, 29: 305–8.
- LONIS, R. (1979), *Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique* (Paris).
- LUPPE, W. (1987), 'Dithyrambos oder Paian: Zu Bakchylides Carm. 23 SN./M.', *ZPE* 69: 9–12.
- LURIA, S. (1927), 'Ein milesischer Männerbund im Lichte ethnologischer Parallelen', *Philologus*, 83: 113–36.
- LUTZ, H. F. (1919), *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts* (Philadelphia).
- MAAS, P. (1913–21), 'Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar', *JPhV* 39: 289–320, 47: 13–31.
- (1933), *Epidaurische Hymnen* (Halle).
- (1954), 'Ἡρώς Θέες', *MH* 11: 199.
- MCCABE, D. F. and PLUNKETT, M. A. (1985), *Teos Inscriptions* (Princeton).
- MACCRIDY, T. (1905), 'Altertümer von Notion I', *Jahreshefte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaft*, 8: 155–73.
- MACLEOD, C. W. (1983), 'Thucydides and Tragedy', in *Collected Essays* (Oxford), 140–58.
- MACLEOD, M. D. (1972–87), *Luciani Opera* (4 vols.; Oxford).
- MCNAMEE, K. (1977), *Marginalia and Commentaries on Greek Literary Papyri* (diss. Duke).
- (1981), *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraca* (Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists, supp. 3; Chico, Calif.).
- (1992), *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (Papyrologica Bruxellensia, 26; Brussels).
- MACURDY, G. H. (1912), 'The Connection of Paean with Paeonia', *CR* 26: 249–51.
- (1930), 'The Derivation of the Greek Word "Paean"', *Language*, 6: 297–303.
- MAEHLER, H. (1968), 'Wartetext 5: Ein Pindarfragment', *ZPE* 3: 97–9.
- (1970), *Bakchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis* (Leipzig).
- (1982–97), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, i. *Die Siegeslieder*, 1. *Edition des Textes mit Einleitung und Übersetzung*. 2. *Kommentar*. ii. *Die Dithyramben und Fragmente* (Mnem. supp. 62, 167; Leiden).
- (1989): see 'Mae' in the Abbreviations.

- MALKIN, I. (1987), *Religion and Colonisation in Ancient Greece* (Leiden).
- MARCHETTI, P. (1977), 'À propos de l'archonte delphien de 344/3', in *Études delphiques* (BCH supp. 4; Athens), 67-89.
- MARCOVICH, M. (1975), 'Philodemus Scarpheus', *ZPE* 18: 167-9.
- MAREK, C. (1985), *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt).
- MARTIN, J.-P. (1982), *Providentia Deorum* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 61; Rome).
- MARTIN, R. P. (1983), *Healing, Sacrifice and Battle: Amechania and Related Concepts in Early Greek Poetry* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 41; Innsbruck).
- MAY, J. M. F. (1966), *The Coinage of Abdera, 540-354 B.C.*, ed. C. M. Kraay and G. F. Jenkins (London).
- MEIGGS, R. (1982), *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford).
- MEIJERING, R. (1987), *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia* (Groningen).
- MEINEKE, A. (1849), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum Quae Supersunt*, i (Berlin).
(1890-4), *J. Stobaeus: Eclogarum Physicarum et Ethicarum Libri Duo* (Leipzig).
- MELLINK, M. J. (1943), *Hyakinthos* (diss. Utrecht).
- MERKELBACH, R. (1973a), 'Αγλαόθρονος', *ZPE* 11: 160.
(1973b), 'Bakchylides auf einen Sieger in der HMEPAΣIA zu Lousoi', *ZPE* 11: 257-60.
(1973c), 'Päonische Strophen bei Pindar und Bakchylides', *ZPE* 12: 45-55.
- METTE, H. (1952), *Parateresis* (Halle).
- MEYER, H. (1933), *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Munich).
- MEYERHOFF, D. (1984), *Traditioneller Stoff und individuelle Gestaltung: Untersuchungen zu Alkaios und Sappho* (Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 3; Hildesheim and New York).
- MIKALSON, J. D. (1976), 'Erechtheus and the Panathenaica', *AJP* 97: 141-53.
- MILANI, C. (1976), 'Osservazioni sul latino lectisternium', *RIL* 110: 231-42.
- MILLER, A. M. (1986), *From Delos to Delphi* (Mnem. supp. 93; Leiden).
— (1989), 'Apolline Ethics and Olympian Victory in Pindar's Eighth Pythian 67-78', *GRBS* 30: 461-84.
- MINEUR, W. H. (1984), *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos* (Mnem. supp. 83; Leiden).
- MOENS, P. W. (1930), *De twee delphische hymnen met muzieknoten* (Utrecht).
- MOMMSEN, A. (1878), *Delphika* (Leipzig).

- (1907), 'Apollon auf Delos', *Philologus*, 66: 433–58.
- MOORE-BLUNT, J. (1978), 'Problems of Accentuation in Greek Papyri', *QUCC* 29: 137–63.
- MOORHOUSE, A. C. (1982), *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Mnem. supp. 75; Leiden).
- MORGAN, C. (1990), *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century B.C.* (Cambridge).
- MORGAN, K. A. (1993), 'Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the *Kṓmos*', *CP* 88: 1–15.
- MORITZ, H. E. (1979), 'Refrain in Aeschylus: Literary Adaptation of Traditional Form', *CP* 74: 187–213.
- MORPURGO-DAVIES, A., and DUHOUX, Y. (1988), *Linear B: A 1984 Survey* (Louvain-la-Neuve).
- MORRIS, S. (1992), *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton).
- MOST, G. (1985), *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Hypomnemata 83; Göttingen).
- (1987), 'Alcman's Cosmogonic Fragment (Fr. 5 Page, 81 Calame)', *CQ*, NS 37: 1–19.
- MOTTE, A. (1987), 'Pèlerinages de la Grèce antique', in J. Chelini and H. Branthomme (eds.), *Histoire des pèlerinages non chrétiens: Entre magique et sacré. Le chemin des dieux* (Paris), 94–135.
- MUCKE, H., and MEEUS, J. (1983), *Canon of Solar Eclipses –2003 to +2526²* (Vienna).
- MÜLLER, G. (1967), *Sophokles: Antigone* (Heidelberg).
- MÜLLER, I. (1914), *Quomodo Pindarus Chori Persona usus est* (Darmstadt).
- MULBEGAT-HOLLER, J. (1927a), 'Pind. Paean VI 110', *Eos*, 30: 32.
- (1927b), 'Pind. Paean 1. 3 (D)', *Eos*, 30: 193.
- NABER, S. A. (1864), *Photii Patriarchii Lexikon* (Leiden).
- NACHMANSON, E. (1941), *Die griechische Buchtitel: Einige Beobachtungen* (Göteborg).
- NACHTERGAEL, G. (1977), *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes: Recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques* (Brussels).
- NAGY, G. (1974), *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Metre* (Cambridge).
- (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore).
- (1986), 'Pindar's *Olympian* 1 and the Aetiology of the Olympic Games', *TAPA* 116: 71–88.
- (1990), *Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore).
- (1996), *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge).
- (forthcoming), 'Genre and Occasion in the Lyric Tradition of Alcaeus'.
- NEUBECKER, A. J. (1977), *Altgriechische Musik* (Darmstadt).

- NEWMAN, J. K. (1967), *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Collection Latomus, 88; Brussels).
- (1986), 'Pindar and Callimachus', *JCS* 11: 169–89.
- NILSSON, M. (1906), *Griechische Feste mit Ausnahme der attischen* (Leipzig; repr. Stuttgart and Leipzig 1996).
- NISBET, R. G. M., and HUBBARD, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book One* (Oxford).
- NOCK, A. D. (1944), 'The Cult of Heroes (II)', *HTR* 37: 141–68; repr. in Z. Stewart (ed.), *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ii (Cambridge, 1972), 575–602.
- NORDEN, E. (1913), *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig).
- (1939), *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (Lund).
- NORWOOD, G. (1956), *Pindar* (Berkeley).
- NÖTHIGER, M. (1971), *Die Sprache des Stesichorus und des Ibycus* (Zurich).
- NÜNLIST, R. (1998), *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart).
- OATES, JOHN F., SAMUEL, ALAN E., and WELLES, C. BRADFORD (1967), *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library* (American Society of Papyrologists, 2; New Haven).
- OEPEKE, A. (1934), 'Ἀμφιθαλείς im griechischen und hellenistischen Kult', *ARW* 31: 42–56.
- OLIVER, J. H. (1936), 'The Sarapion Monument and the Paean of Sophocles', *Hesperia*, 5: 91–122.
- (1940), 'Paeanistae', *TAPA* 71: 302–14.
- (1949), 'Two Greek Poets', *Hesperia*, supp. 8: 243–58.
- and MAAS, P. (1939), 'An Ancient Poem on the Duties of a Physician', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 7: 315–23.
- OPPÉ, A. P. (1904), 'The Chasm at Delphi', *JHS* 24: 214–40.
- OTTO, W. F. (1981), *Dionysus: Myth and Cult*, trans. R. B. Palmer (Dallas).
- PACK, R. A. (1967), *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*² (Ann Arbor).
- PAGE, D. L. (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford).
- (1956), 'ὑποκριτής', *CR* 70: 191–2.
- (1973), 'Stesichorus: The Geryoneis', *JHS* 93: 138–54.
- PALMER, L. R. (1963), *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts* (Oxford).
- PALMER, R. E. A. (1993), 'Paean and Paeanists of Serapis', in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor), 355–68.
- PANAGL, O. (1969–70), 'Stationen hellenischer Religiosität am Beispiel des delphischen Sukzessionsmythos', *Kairos*, 11 (1969), 161–71; *ibid.* 12 (1970), 31–41.

- PAPAGEORGIOU, P. N. (1888), *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera* (Leipzig).
- PAPASTAMOS, D. (1970), *Melische Amphoren* (Münster).
- PAPE, W. (1880), *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*³ (2 vols.; Brunswick).
- PARKE, H. W. (1967), *The Oracles of Zeus: Dodona, Olympia, Ammon* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (1977), *Festivals of Athens* (London).
- PARKE, H. W., and WORMELL, D. E. W. (1956), *A History of the Delphic Oracle* (Oxford).
- PARKER, R. (1983), *Miasma* (Oxford).
- PARRY, H. (1965), 'The Second Stasimon of Euripides, *Heracles* (637–700)', *AJP* 86: 363–74.
- PASQUALI, G. (1920), *Orazio lirico* (Florence).
- PAVESE, C. O. (1967), 'The New *Heracles* Poem of Pindar', *HSCP* 72: 66–88.
- (1972), *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica* (Rome).
- (1993), 'On Pindar, fr. 169', *HSCP* 95: 143–55.
- PEARSON, A. C. (1911), 'On Soph. *Phil.* 830 ff.', *CR* 25: 246–7.
- PEARSON, L. (1990), *Aristoxenus: Elementa Rhythmica* (Oxford).
- and STEPHENS, S. (1983), *Didymi in Demosthenem Commenta* (Stuttgart).
- PEASE, A. S. (1942), 'Some Aspects of Invisibility', *HSCP* 53: 1–36.
- PEEK, W. (1930), *Der Isishymnus von Andros und Verwandte Texte* (Berlin).
- PEEK, W. (1980), *Attische Versinschriften* (ASAW 69. 2).
- PELLICIA, H. (1990), 'Aeschylean ἀμείαπτος and Virgilian *inamabilis*', *ZPE* 84: 187–94.
- (1995), *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar* (Hypomnemata, 107; Göttingen).
- PERING, B. (1933), 'Die geflügelte Scheibe', *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 8: 281–96.
- PÉRON, J. (1974), *Les Images maritimes de Pindare* (Études et Commentaires, 87; Paris).
- PERRY, B. E. (1952), *Aesopica* (Urbana).
- PETERSON, I. V. (1982), 'Singing of a Place: Pilgrimage as Metaphor and Motif in the Tēvāram Songs of the Tamil Śaivite Saints', *JAS* 102: 69 ff.
- (1989), *Poems to Śiva: The Hymns of the Tamil Saints* (Princeton).
- PFEIFFER, R. (1949–53), *Callimachus* (2 vols.; Oxford).
- (1952), 'The Image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline Ethics', *JWI* 15: 20–32.
- (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford).

- PFISTER, F. (1930), *Religion der Griechen und Römer mit einer Einführung in die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft* (Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, supp. 229; Leipzig).
- PICCIRILLI, L. (1967), 'Ricerche sul culto di Hyacinthus', *SCO* 16: 99-116.
- PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, A. W. (1962), *Dithyramb, Tragedy, Comedy*² (rev. T. B. L. Webster) (Oxford).
- (1968), *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (rev. J. Gould and T. B. L. Webster) (Oxford).
- PICTET, A. (1856), 'Etymologische Forschungen über die älteste Arzneikunst bei den Indogermanen', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 5: 24-50.
- PINGIATOGLOU, S. (1981), *Eileithyia* (Würzburg).
- PINOTTI, P. (1977), 'Propert. IV 9: Alessandrinismo e arte allusiva', *GIF* 29: 50-71.
- PISANI, V. (1929), 'Miscellanea etimologica', *Rendiconti della Accademia Lincei*, 6/5: 207-29.
- PINTAUDI, R. (1995), 'PSI II 147: Provenienza e statistiche', *Analecta Papyrologica*, 7: 31-3.
- PLATTER, C. (1994), 'Heracles, Deianeira, and Nessus: Reverse Chronology and Human Knowledge in Bacchylides 16', *AJP* 115: 337-49.
- POHLENZ, M. (1926), 'Das Satyrspiel von Pratinas von Phleius', *NGG* 3: 298-321; repr. in Pohlenz (1965), ii. 473-96.
- (1933), 'τὸ πῆπρον: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes', *NGG* 1.1.16: 53-92; repr. in Pohlenz (1965), i. 100-39.
- (1940), 'Kleanthes' Zeushymnus', *Hermes*, 75: 117-23; repr. in Pohlenz (1965), i. 87-93.
- (1965), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. M. Dörrie (2 vols.; Hildesheim).
- PÖHLMANN, E. (1970), *Denkmäler altgriechischer Musik* (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, 31; Nuremberg).
- POLAND, F. (1909), *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig).
- (1921), 'Pindar Paeon VI. 50', *PW* 41: 332-3.
- (1935), 'Μολποί', *RE* supp. vi. 509-20.
- PORDOMINGO PARDO, F. (1984), 'El Peán de Macedónico a Apolo y Asclépio: Un nuevo hallazgo epigráfico', *Corolla Londiniensis*, 4: 101-29.
- POUILLOUX, J. (1953-8), *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes du Thasos* (2 vols.; Études Thasiennes 3, 5; Paris).
- (1983), 'Delphes dans les Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore: La réalité dans la fiction', *Journal des savants*, 259-286.
- POZZI, D. C. (1979), 'Un peán ignorado en la "Antígona" de Sófocles', *Argos*, 3: 21-30.
- PRELLER, L. (1838), *Polemonis Periegetae Fragmenta* (Leipzig).
- PRETAGOSTINI, R. (1977), 'Prisciano ed alcuni versi "giambici" nella lirica

- greca arcaica (Alcmane, Anacreonte, Simonide e Pindaro)', *QUCC* 26: 63-78.
- (1980), 'Considerazioni sui cosiddetti "metra ex iambis orta" in Simonide, Pindaro e Bacchilide', *QUCC* 35 (NS 6): 127-33.
- PRIDIK, A. (1892), *De Cei Insulae Rebus* (Berlin).
- PRITCHETT, W. K. (1971-91), *The Greek State at War* (5 vols.; Berkeley).
- PRIVITERA, G. A. (1972), 'Il peana sacro ad Apollo', *Cultura e scuola*, 41: 41-9; repr. in Calame (1977b), 17-24.
- (1986), 'Il criterio della pertinenza: Pind. *Ol.* 9. 35-41', *RFIC* 114 (NS 64): 48-54.
- (1988), 'Pindaro, *Nem.* III 1-5, e l'acqua di Egina', *QUCC* 58 (NS 29): 63-70.
- PUECH, A. (1952), *Pindarus*, iv. *Isthmiques et fragments* (Paris).
- PUHVEL, J. (1970), 'An "Indo-European" Construction in Arcadian', *CP* 65: 50-1.
- PUSCH, H. (1890), *Quaestiones Zenodoteae* (Dissertationes philologicae Ha-lenses, 11; Halle), 119-216.
- QUANDT, W. (1955), *Orphei Hymni* (Berlin).
- RABE, H. (1906), *Scholia in Lucianum* (Leipzig).
- (1928), *Johannes Sardianos: In Aphthonii Progymnasmata* (Leipzig).
- RACE, W. H. (1982), 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns', *GRBS* 23: 5-14.
- (1987), 'P.Oxy. 2438 and the Order of Pindar's Works', *RM* 130: 407-10.
- (1990), *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta).
- RADT, S. L. (1958), *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian: Text, Scholien und Kommentar* (Amsterdam).
- RAINER, B. L. (1975), *Philodamus' Paeon to Dionysus: A Literary Expression of Delphic Propaganda* (diss. Illinois).
- RAUSCH, H. (1982), *Theoria: Von ihrer sakralen zur philosophischen Bedeutung* (Munich).
- RAVEN, E. J. P. (1967), review of May (1966), in *Numismatic Chronicle* 7: 289-97.
- REDFIELD, J. (1985), 'Herodotus the Tourist', *CP* 80: 97-118.
- REINACH, T. (1898), 'Deux fragments d'hyporchèmes anonymes', in *Mélanges H. Weil* (Paris), 413-22.
- REINER, E. (1938), *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen* (Tübingen).
- REINSCH-WERNER, H. (1976), *Callimachus Hesiodeus* (Berlin).
- REISKE, J. J. (1777), *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opera*, vi (Leipzig).
- REITZENSTEIN, R. (1883), *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung* (Giessen).
- RENEHAN, R. (1969), *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (Cambridge).
- (1982), 'Aristotle as Lyric Poet', *GRBS* 23: 251-74.

- REYMOND, E. A. E. (1969), *The Mythical Origin of the Egyptian Temple* (Manchester).
- RHODES, P. J. (1981), *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford).
- RIBEZZO, F. (1921), 'Ad Pind. Paean VI 105-109', *RIGI* 5: 240.
- RICHARDSON, N. J. (1974), *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford).
- (1985), 'Pindar and Later Literary Criticism', *PLLS* 5: 393-401.
- RIEGER, D. (1976), *Gattungen und Gattungenbezeichnungen der Trobadorlyrik: Untersuchungen zum altprovenzalischen Sirventes* (Tübingen).
- ROBERT, C. R. (1879), *Thanatos* (Berlin).
- (1914), 'Zu Pindars VIII. Paean', *Hermes*, 49: 315-19.
- ROBERT, L. (1940) 'Ἀμφιθαλής', *HSCP* supp. 1: 509-19.
- (1960), 'Sur un décret des Koressiens au Musée de Smyrne', *HelLENICA*, 11-12: 132-76.
- and ROBERT, J. (1976), 'Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie: L'Union de Téos et de Kyrdissos', *Journal des savants*, 154-235.
- ROBERTSON, D. S. (1927), 'Pindar, Paean II. 29' *PCPS* 1.
- ROBERTSON, N. (1987), 'Government and Society at Miletus, 525-442 B.C.', *Phoenix*, 41: 356-98.
- ROBINSON, E. S. G. (1949), 'The Athenian Currency Decree and the Coinage of the Allies', *Hesperia*, supp. 8: 324-40.
- RODE, J. (1971), 'Das Chorlied', in Jens (1971), 85-115.
- ROSCHER, W. H. (1884-1937), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (6 vols.; Leipzig).
- (1913), *Omphalos: Eine philologisch, archäologisch, volkscundliche Abhandlung über die Vorstellungen der Griechen und anderer Völker vom 'Nabel der Erde'* (ASAW 29. 9; Leipzig).
- (1915), *Neue Omphalosstudien: Ein archäologischer Beitrag zur vergleichenden Religionswissenschaft* (ASAW 31. 1; Leipzig).
- (1918), *Der Omphalosgedanke bei verschiedenen Völkern, besonders den semitischen* (SBLA 70/2; Leipzig).
- ROSSI, L. E. (1971), 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche', *BICS* 18: 69-94.
- ROUGEMONT, G. (1977), 'Les Théores d'Andros à Delphes', in *Études delphiques* (BCH supp. 4; Athens), 37-47.
- ROUSE, W. H. D. (1902), *Greek Votive Offerings: An Essay in the History of Greek Religion* (Cambridge).
- ROUSSEL, P. (1942), 'Décret des Péliganes de Laodicée-sur-Mer', *Syria*, 23: 21-32.
- ROUX, G. (1962), 'Pindare, le prétendu Trésor des Crétois et l'ancienne statue d'Apollon à Delphes', *RÉG* 75: 366-80.
- RUENSOHN, O. (1949), 'Paros', *RE* xxxvi. 1781-872.
- (1962), *Das Delion auf Paros* (Wiesbaden).

- RUIJGH C. J. (1967), *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien* (Amsterdam).
- (1968), 'Les noms en *-won-* (*-awon*, *iwon-*), *-uon-* en grec alphabétique et en mycénien', *Minos*, 109–55.
- RUMPF, A. (1964), 'Bienen als Baumeister', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 6: 5–8.
- RUSSELL, D. A. (1990), 'Aristides and the Prose Hymn', in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford), 199–219.
- RUSTEN J. S. (1982), 'Dicearchus and the Tales from Euripides', *GRBS* 23: 357–67.
- (1983), 'Τέτρων ἥρωες: Pindar's Prayer to Heracles and Greek Popular Religion', *HSCP* 87: 289–97.
- RUTHERFORD, I. C. (1988), 'Pindar on the Birth of Apollo', *CQ* 38: 65–75.
- (1990), 'Paeans by Simonides', *HSCP* 93: 169–209.
- (1991a), 'New Fragments of Pindar's Paeans', *ZPE* 86: 5–8.
- (1991b), 'Neoptolemus and the Paean-cry', *ZPE* 88: 1–10.
- (1991c), 'Pindar "Paean" VIII A, the "Cassandra" of Bacchylides and the Anonymous "Cassandra" in P.Oxy. 2368: An Exploration in Lyric Structure', *Eos*, 79: 5–12.
- (1992), 'Two Heroic Prosodia: A Study of Pindar, *Pa.* XIV–V', *ZPE* 92: 59–72.
- (1993), 'Paeanic Ambiguity: A Study of the Representation of the Παῖαν in Greek Literature', *QUCC* 73 (NS 44): 77–92.
- (1995a), 'Apollo in Ivy: The Tragic Paean', *Arion*, 3/2: 112–35.
- (1995b), 'Apollo's Other Genre: Proclus on *Nomos* and his Source', *CP* 90: 354–61.
- (1995c), 'The Nightingale's Refrain: *POxy* 2625 = SLG 460', *ZPE* 107: 39–43.
- (1995d), 'Et hominum et deorum . . . laudes (?): The Organisation of Pindar's Paean-book', *ZPE* 107: 44–52.
- (1995e), 'Theoric Crisis: The Dangers of Pilgrimage in Greek Religion and Society', *SMSR* 61: 275–92.
- (1995f), 'The Poetics of the Paraphthegma: Aelius Aristides and the Decorum of Self-praise', in D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell* (Oxford), 195–204.
- (1996a), 'The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary', *Arethusa*, 29: 167–92.
- (1996b), 'Pindarus Armenicus: *Paean* IX 1–10 as Transmitted in Philo, *De Prov.* 2 (97 Aucher)', *ZPE* 112: 37–46.
- (1997a), 'Odes and Ends: Closure and Greek Lyric Poetry', in D. Roberts and D. P. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton), 43–61.

- (1997b), 'For the Aeginetans to Aiakos a Prosodion: An Unnoticed Title at Pindar, Paean 6, 123 and its Significance for the Poem', *ZPE* 118: 1-21.
- (1998a), 'The Amphikleidai of Sicilian Naxos: Pilgrimage and Genos in the Temple Inventories of Delos', *ZPE* 123: 81-90.
- (1998b), *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age: Studies in The Ideology of Hermogenes and Ps. Aristides* (Oxford).
- (2000a), 'Keos or Delos? State Pilgrimage and the Performance of Paean 4', in *Poesia e religione in Grecia: Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera* (Naples), 605-12.
- (2000b), 'Paeans at Ptolemais', *ZPE*.
- (2000c), 'Theoria and Darśan: Pilgrimage and Vision in Greece and India', *CQ*, NS 50: 133-46.
- (2000d), 'προσώδιον: A Musical Term in a Delian Inscription (*IG* 11. 120. 49)', *ZPE*.
- (2001), 'Paralipomena Paeonica'.
- (forthcoming), 'Χορός εἰς ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως: State-pilgrimage and Song-dance in Athens', in P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds.), *Music and Culture in Ancient Greece*.
- and IRVINE, J. A. D. (1988), 'The Race in the Athenian Oschophoria and an Oschophoricon in Pindar', *ZPE* 72: 43-51.
- and NAIDEN, F. (1996), 'Amphion's Paean: A Note on Propertius, 3. 15. 42', *MD* 37: 231-8.
- SAHIN, M. C. (1981), 'Aetos: The Greek Pediment', *ZPE* 44: 146.
- SAMUEL, A. E. (1972), *Greek and Roman Chronology* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 1/7; Berlin).
- SANDOZ, C. (1971), *Les Noms grecs de la forme: Étude linguistique* (Berne).
- SANDYS, J. (1915), *The Odes of Pindar, Including the Principal Fragments, with an Introduction and an English Translation* (London and New York).
- SANSONE, D. (1975), 'The Sacrifice-motif in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris*', *TAPA* 105: 283-95.
- SCALIGER, J. (1577), *Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* (Paris).
- SCHACHTER, A. (1967), 'A Boeotian Cult Type', *BICS* 14: 1-16.
- (1981-94), *Cults of Boeotia* (BICS supp. 38; 4 vols.; London).
- SCHAUENBURG, K. (1955), *Helios: Archäologisch-mythologische Studien über den antiken Sonnengott* (Berlin).
- SCHIEER, E. (1908), *Lycophron: Alexandra*, ii. *Scholia* (Berlin).
- SCHMIDT, D. (1990), 'Bacchylides 17: Paean or Dithyramb?', *Hermes*, 118: 18-31.
- SCHMIDT, M. (1854), *Didymi Chalcenteri Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta Quae Supersunt Omnia* (Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire; Leipzig).

- SCHMIDT, V. (1975), 'Zu Pindar', *Glotta*, 53: 36-43.
- SCHMITT, R. (1967), *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden).
- (1970), *Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos von Kyrene: Ein Beitrag zur Stellung seines Wortschatzes innerhalb des Griechischen* (Wiesbaden).
- SCHNEIDER, J. G. (1776), *Carminum Pindaricorum Fragmenta* (Strasburg).
- SCHÖNEWOLF H. (1938), *Der jungattische Dithyrambos: Wesen, Wirkung, Gegenwirkung* (Giessen).
- SCHREIBER T. (1879), *Apollo Pythoktonos* (Leipzig).
- SCHROEDER O. (1900): see PLG in Abbreviations.
- (1903), review of POxy iii, in *PW* 23: 1441 ff.
- (1908), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis Selectis* (Leipzig).
- (1914), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis Selectis* (Leipzig).
- (1923), *Pindari Carmina*³, with appendix (Leipzig).
- SCHUBART, W. (1918), 'Ein griechischer Papyrus mit Noten', *SBBAW* 763-68.
- SCHÜRCH, P. (1971), *Zur Wortresponion bei Pindar* (Berne).
- SCHWABL, H. (1972), 'Zeus I: Epiklesen', *RE* xixa. 253-376.
- SCHWALBE, K. (1847), *Über die Bedeutung des Pääns als Gesang im apollinischen Kultus* (diss. Magdeburg).
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1887), *Scholia in Euripidem* (Berlin).
- SCHWARZ, P. (1897), *De Ephymniorum apud Aeschylum Usu* (Halle).
- SCHWYZER, E. (1912), 'Zur griechischen Etymologie', *IF* 30: 430-48.
- (1939-53), *Griechische Grammatik* (4 vols.; Munich).
- SCODEL, R. (1977), 'Apollo's Perfidy: *Iliad* Ω 59-61', *HSCP* 81: 55-7.
- (1980), *The Trojan Trilogv of Euripides* (Hypomnemata, 60; Göttingen).
- SEAFORD, R. (1977-8), 'The "Hyporchema" of Pratinas', *Maia*, 29: 81-94.
- (1984), *Euripides: Cyclops* (Oxford).
- SEGAL, C. P. (1967), 'Pindar's Seventh Nemean', *TAPA* 98: 445-80.
- (1983), 'Kleos and its Ironies in the Odyssey', *AC* 52: 22-47.
- (1977a), 'Synaesthesia in Sophocles', *ICS* 2: 88-96.
- (1977b), 'Philoctetes and the Imperishable Piety', *Hermes*, 105: 133-58.
- SEYRIG, H. (1927), 'Quatre cultes de Thasos (I): Apollon', *BCH* 51: 178-233.
- SEVERYNS, A. (1934), 'Proclus et la chanson de table', in *Mélanges Bidez* (Ann. de l'inst. de phil. et d'hist. orient, 2; Brussels), 835-6.
- (1939), *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus, i. Le Codex 239 de Photius* (Liège).
- SHAPIRO, K. D. (1988), '"Υμνος θησαυρός: Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi', *MH* 45: 1-5.

- SHELMERDINE, S. (1987), 'Pindaric Praise and the Third Olympian', *HSCP* 91: 65-81.
- SHIPLEY, G. (1987), *A History of Samos* (Oxford).
- SHOREY, P. (1910), 'A Greek Analogue to the Romance Adverb', *CP* 5: 83-96.
- SIEBERT, G. (1973), 'Reflexions sur la notion de pèlerinages dans la Grèce antique', in F. Raphael *et al.* (eds.), *Les pèlerinages de l'antiquité biblique et classique à l'occident médiéval* (Strasbourg), 33-53.
- SIFAKIS, G. M. (1967), 'Singing Dolphin Riders', *BICS* 14: 36-7.
- (1971), *Parabasis and Animal Choruses* (London).
- SILK, M. S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (London).
- (1985), 'Heracles and Greek Tragedy', *GR* 32: 1-22.
- SIMON, E. (1953), *Opfernde Götter* (Berlin).
- SINKO, E. (1926), 'De Horatii Carmine 1. 15 eiusque Exemplari Graeco', *Eos*, 29: 135-55.
- SITZLER, J. (1911a), review of Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*¹, in *PW* 31: 1082-5.
- (1911b), 'Zum zweiten Pāan Pindars', *WKPh* 28: 586-90.
- (1911c), 'Zum vierten Pāan Pindars', *WKPh* 28: 698-702.
- (1911d), 'Zum sechsten Pāan Pindars', *WKPh* 28: 1015-18.
- SJÖBERG, A. W., BERGMANN, E., and GRAGG, G. B. (1969), *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns and the Kes Temple Hymns* (Texts from Cuneiform Sources, 3; New York).
- SJÖVALL, H. (1931), *Zeus im altgriechischen Hauskult* (Lund).
- SLATER, W. J. (1969a), *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).
- (1969b), 'Futures in Pindar', *CQ* 19: 86-94.
- (1986), *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Berlin).
- SMITH, J. R. (1922), *Springs and Wells in Greek and Roman Literature: Their Legends and Associations* (New York).
- SMITH, O. L. (1976-82), *Scholia in Aeschylum* (2 vols.; Leipzig).
- (1984), 'Pindar's Seventh Nemean Ode', *CM* 35: 5-17.
- SMYTH, H. W. (1900), *Greek Melic Poets* (London).
- SNELL, B. (1937), 'Euripides *Alexandros* und andere Straßburg-Papyri und Fragmente griechischer Dichter' (Hermes Einzelschriften, 5; Berlin).
- (1938), 'Identifikationen von Pindarbruchstücken', *Hermes*, 73: 424-39.
- (1940), 'Drei Berliner Papyri mit Stücken alter Chorlyrik', *Hermes*, 75: 177-91.
- (1953), *The Discovery of Mind*, trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer of *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*² (Hamburg, 1948) (Oxford).
- (1962), 'Pindars achter Paian über den Tempel von Delphi', *Hermes*, 90: 1-6.
- (1964): see 'Sn' in the Abbreviations.

- and MAEHLER, H. (1975, 1987): see 'SnMae' in the Abbreviations.
- SOMMERSTEIN, A. H. (1980), *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, i. *Acharnians* (Warminster).
- SOURVINOU-INWOOD, C. (1979), 'The Myth of the Four Temples at Delphi', *CQ* 29: 231-51; repr. in Sourvinou-Inwood (1991), 192-216.
- (1987), 'Myth as History: The Previous Owners of the Delphic Oracle', in J. Bremmer, *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London), 215-41; repr. in Sourvinou-Inwood (1991), 217-43.
- (1990), 'What is *Polis*-religion?', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 295-322.
- (1991), 'Reading' *Greek Culture: Texts and Images, Rituals and Myths* (Oxford).
- SPENGEL, L. (1853-6), *Rhetores Graeci* (Leipzig).
- SPENSER, P. (1985), *Society and the Dance* (Cambridge).
- SPIRO, F. (1903), *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* (Leipzig).
- STAGAKIS, G. (1968), 'Ἑρως in the *Iliad*', *Historia*, 17: 385-99.
- STAMBAUGH, J. E. (1972), *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies* (Leiden).
- STEFOS, A. (1975), *Apollon dans Pindare* (Athens).
- STEHLÉ, E. (1996), *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting* (Princeton).
- STEIBLE, H. (1991), *Die neusumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften* (Freiburger altorientalische Studien, 9. 1; Wiesbaden).
- STEPHEN, G. M. (1959), 'The Coronis', *Scriptorium*, 13: 1-14.
- STEWART, A. (1982), 'Dionysus at Delphi: The Pediments of the Sixth Temple of Apollo and Religious Reform in the Age of Alexander', in B. Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Studies in the History of Art, 10; Washington), 205-27.
- STINTON, T. C. W. (1976), 'Si Credere Dignum Est', *PCPS* 202: 60-89; repr. in *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990), 236-64.
- STOCKER, A. F., and TRAVIS, A. H. (1965), *Servianorum in Vergilium Carmina Commentariorum Editionis Harvardianae* vol. iii (Oxford).
- STORCK, K. C. (1912), *Die ältesten Sagen der Insel Keos* (Mainz).
- STRANGE, J. (1980), *Caphtor/Keftiu: A New Investigation* (Leiden).
- STROUD, R. S. (1979), *The axones and kyrbeis of Drakon and Solon* (Berkeley).
- (1994), 'The Aiakeion and Tholos of Athens in POxy 2087', *ZPE* 103: 1-9.
- STRUNK, K. (1960), 'Frühe Vokalveränderungen in der griechischen Literatur', *Glotta*, 38: 74-89.
- STUEDEMUND, W. (1886), *Anecdota Varia Graeca et Latina*, i (Berlin).
- STUDNICZKA, F. (1902), 'Eine Corruptel im Ion des Euripides', *Hermes*, 37: 258-70.

- STULZ, H. (1990), *Die Farbe Purpur im frühen Griechentum: Beobachtet in der Literatur und in der bildenden Kunst* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 6; Stuttgart).
- STURZ, F. W. (1820), *Orionis Thebani Etymologicon* (Leipzig).
- SYLBURG, F. (1586), ed. *Dionysii Halicarnassei Scripta Quae Exstant Omnia et Historica et Rhetorica* . . . (2 vols.; Frankfurt).
- SVENBRO, J. (1984), 'Il taglio della poesia: Note sulle origini sacrificali della poetica greca', *Studi storici*, 25: 925-44.
- TAILLARDAT, J. (1986), 'Sur deux passages de la VIII^e Pythique', *RÉG* 99: 225-38.
- TAUSEND, K. (1992), *Amphiktyonie und Symmachie* (Historia Einzelschriften, 73; Stuttgart).
- THEILER, W. (1941), *Die zwei Zeitstufen in Pindars Stil und Vers* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 17. Jahr, vol. iv; Halle).
- THILO, G., and HAGEN, H. (1881-1902), *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii* (Leipzig).
- THUMMER, E. (1957), *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Commentationes Aenipontanae, 13; Innsbruck).
- TOEPFFER, J. (1888), 'Die attischen Pythiasten und Deliasten', *Hermes*, 23: 321-32.
- TÖLLE, R. (1964), *Frühgriechische Reigentänze* (Waldassen).
- TOMLINSON, R. A. (1983), *Epidauros* (Austin).
- TOSI, T. (1908), 'Sul sesto Peana di Pindaro', *Atene e Roma*, 11: 201-20.
- TOTTI, M. (1985), *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapis-Religion* (Hildesheim).
- TREU, M. (1967), review of Bowra (1964), in *Gymnasium*, 74: 149-53.
- TRILLES, H. (1931), *Les Pygmées de la Forêt équatoriale* (Paris).
- TRÜMPY, C. (1988), *Vergleich des Mykenischen mit der Sprache der Choralik* (Berne).
- TUGENDHAT, E. (1960), 'Zum Rechtfertigungsproblem in Pindars 7. Nemeischen Gedicht', *Hermes*, 88: 385-409.
- TURNER, E. G. (1987), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*², rev. Peter Parsons (Oxford).
- TURYN, A. (1948), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Cracow; repr. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1952).
- UCCIARDELLO, G. (1996-7), 'Riesame di POxy. 2368: Alcuni problemi di lettura e di ricostruzione', *Analecta Papyrologica*, 8-9.
- UHLIG, G. (1883), *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica* (Leipzig).
- UNGER, G. F. (1877), 'Der Isthmientag und die Hyakinthien', *Philologus*, 37: 1-42.
- UNGNAD, A. (1943), 'Figurenzauber für den kranken König Samas-sumukin', *Orientalia*, 12: 293-310.

- USENER, H. (1896), *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* (Bonn).
- and RADERMACHER, L. (1889), *Dionysii Halicarnassei Opera* (2 vols.; Leipzig).
- VAN DER KOLF (1923), *Quaeritur Quomodo Pindarus Fabulas Tractaverit Quidque in eis Mutarit* (diss. Leiden; Rotterdam).
- VANDERLIP, V. F. (1972), *The Four Greek Hymns of Isidorus and the Cult of Isis* (American Studies in Papyrology, 12; Toronto).
- VAN DER VALK, M. (1982), 'Euripides' *Phoenissae* 1-2 and Sophocles' *Electra* 1 Again', *GRBS* 23: 235-40.
- VAN DER WEIDEN, M. J. H. (1991), *The Dithyrambs of Pindar: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Amsterdam).
- VAN GRONINGEN, B. A. (1960), *Pindare au banquet* (Leiden).
- VAN MINNEN, P. (1997), 'The Performance and Readership of the Persai of Timotheus', *Arch. für Pap.* 43: 246-60.
- (1963), review of *POxy* xxvi, in *Gnomon*, 35: 127-30.
- (1977), *Euphorion* (Amsterdam).
- VAN SCHOEFFER, V. (1889), *De Deli Insulae Rebus* (Berliner Studien, 9; Berlin).
- VAN SICKLE, J. (1980), 'The Book-roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book', *Arethusa* 13: 5-42.
- VENERI, A. (1977), 'Κλέος in Pindaro (Paeon VIIa=fr. 52g (A), 7) e Φιλότος in IG 12. 1. 719', *QUCC* 25: 53-8.
- VENTRIS, M., and CHADWICK, J. (1973), *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*² (Cambridge).
- VERBRUGGEN H. (1981), *Le Zeus crétois* (Paris).
- VERCOUTTER J. (1956), *L'Égypte et le monde égéen préhellénique* (Cairo).
- VERRALL, A. W. (1908), 'The Paeans of Pindar and Other New Literature', *CR* 22: 110-18 = *Collected Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship*, ed. M. A. Bayfield and J. D. Duff (Cambridge, 1913), 113-35.
- VIDAL-NAQUET, P. (1981), 'Les esclaves immortales d'Athéna', in *Le chasseur noir* (Paris), 249-66; trans. as 'Slave Women of Athena Ilias', in *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Society in the Greek World*, trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak (Baltimore, 1988), 189-204.
- VIDMAN, L. (1969), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* (Berlin).
- VILATTE, S. (1988), 'Apollon-le dauphin et Poséidon l'Ébranleur: Structure familiale et souveraineté chez les Olympiens; à propos du sanctuaire de Delphes', in M.-M. Mactoux and E. Geny (eds.), *Mélanges P. Lévêque*, 1 (Paris), 307-30.
- VITELLI, G. (1913), editio princeps of PSI 147, *Papiri greci e latini*, ii (Florence), 73-9.
- VOIGT, E.-M. (1971), *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam).

- VOLLGRAFF, W. (1956), *Le Sanctuaire d'Apollon Pythéen à Argos* (Études Péloponnésiennes, 1; Paris).
- VOLKMANN, R. (1856), *Plutarch: De Musica* (Leipzig).
- VON ARNIM, H. (1909), 'Pindars Pään für die Abderiten', in *Wiener Eranos zur 50. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Graz* (Vienna), 8-14.
- VON BLUMENTHAL, A. (1942), 'Der Apollontempel des Trophonius und Agamedes in Delphi', *Philologus*, 83: 220-4.
- (1943), 'Paian', *RE* xxxvi. 2340-62.
- VON BÜLOW, P. (1929), 'Ein vielgesungener Asklepiospaean', in *Xenia Bonnensia* (Bonn), 35-49.
- VON DER MÜHLL, P. (1951), 'Kultische und andere Mahlzeiten bei Alkman', in *Heimat und Humanität: Festschrift für K. Meuli* (Schweizerische Archiv für Volkskunde, 47; Basle), 208-15.
- (1970), 'Hesiods helikonische Musen', *MH* 27: 195-7.
- VON FRITZE, H. (1912), *Die Elektronprägung von Kyzikos* (Nomisma 7; Berlin).
- VON POMTOW, H. (1901), 'Delphoi', *RE* viii. 2520-700.
- VOS, H. (1956), *Themis* (Assen).
- VOX, O. (1984), 'Prima del trionfo: I ditirambi 17 e 18 di Bacchilide', *AC* 53: 200-9.
- WAANDERS, F. M. J. (1983), *The History of τέλος and τελέω in Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam).
- WACHSMUTH, D. (1967), *Πόμπιμος ὁ Δαίμων: Untersuchungen zu den antiken Sakralhandlungen bei Seereisen* (Berlin).
- WACKERNAGEL, J. (1925), 'Griechische Miszellen', *Glotta*, 14: 36-67; repr. in Wackernagel (1953-79), ii. 844-75.
- (1943), 'Graeca', *Philologus*, 95: 177-92; repr. in Wackernagel (1953-79), ii. 876-91.
- (1953-79) *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen).
- (1957), *Vorlesungen über Syntax*² (2 vols.; Basle).
- WADE-GERY, H. T. (1936), 'Kynaithos', in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford), 58-78; repr. in *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford, 1958), 17-36.
- (1949), 'A Note on the Origin of the Spartan Gymnopaedia', *CQ* 43: 79-81.
- WAGMAN, R. S. (1986), 'Le citazioni pindariche in Strab. IX, 2, 33-4', *Athenaeum*, 64: 111-26.
- WALLIS BUDGE, E. A. (1934), *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt* (Oxford).
- WATKINS, C. (1966), 'An Indo-European Construction in Greek and Latin', *HSCP* 71: 115-19.
- (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York).
- WEBSTER, T. B. L. (1967), *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London).

- (1970), *The Greek Chorus* (London).
- WEHRLI, F. R. (1967–78), *Die Schule des Aristoteles*² (Basle): i. *Dikaiarchos* (1967); ii. *Aristoxenos* (1967); iii. *Klearchos* (1969); iv. *Demetrios von Phaleron* (1968); v. *Straton von Lampsakos* (1969); vi. *Lykon von Keos* (1968); vii. *Herakleides Pontikos* (1969); viii. *Eudemos von Rhodos* (1969); ix. *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (1969); x. *Hieronimos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schule. Rückblick: Der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit. Register* (1969); supp. 1. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer* (1974); supp. 2. *Sotion* (1978).
- WEIL, H. (1893), 'Inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 17: 561–83.
- (1894), 'Un nouvel hymne à Apollon', *BCH* 18: 345–62.
- (1908), 'Textes grecs récemment découverts', *Journal des savants*, 6: 302–8.
- WELCKER, F. G. (1857), *Griechische Götterlehre*, i (Göttingen).
- WENDEL, K. (1958), *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera* (Berlin).
- WENSINCK, A. J. (1916), *Ideas of Western Semites concerning the Navel of the Earth* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie, 17; Amsterdam); repr. in *Studies of A. J. Wensinck* (New York, 1978).
- WERLEN, I. (1984), *Ritual und Sprache: Zum Verhältnis von Sprechen und Handeln in Ritualen* (Tübingen).
- WERNER, O. (1967), *Pindars Siegesgesänge und Fragmente* (Munich).
- WERNICKE, K. (1895), 'Apollon', *RE* iii. 1–111.
- WEST, M. L. (1964), *Hesiod's Theogony* (Oxford).
- (1970), 'Corinna', *CQ* 20: 277–87.
- (1971), 'Stesichorus', *CQ* 21: 302–14.
- (1975), 'Cynaethus' Hymn to Apollo', *CQ* 25: 161–70.
- (1980), 'Iambic in Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar', *ZPE* 37: 137–55.
- (1981), 'The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music', *JHS* 101: 113–29.
- (1982), *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
- (1983), 'Tragica VI: 12: Aeschylus, Lycurgeia', *BICS* 30: 63–82.
- (1984), *Carmina Anacreontea* (Leipzig).
- (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford).
- (1990), 'Ringing Welkins', *CQ* 84: 286–7.
- (1992a), 'Analecta Musica', *ZPE* 92: 1–54.
- (1992b), *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
- WESTENHOLZ, J. G. (1989), 'Enheduanna, En-Priestess, Hen of Nanna, Spouse of Nanna', in H. Behrens, D. Leding, and M. T. Roth (eds.), *DUMU-E₂-DUB. BA. A: Studies in Honor of Åke W. Sjöberg* (Philadelphia), 539–56.
- WESTERINK, L. G. (1977), *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo* (2 vols.; Amsterdam).

- WHITE, J. W. (1914), *The Scholia to the Aves of Aristophanes* (Boston and London).
- WIDE, S. (1893), *Lakonische Kulte* (Leipzig; repr. Darmstadt, 1973).
- (1907), 'Chthonische und himmlische Götter', *ARW* 10: 257-68.
- WIECHERS, A. (1961), *Aesop in Delphi* (Meinsenheim a. Glan).
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON (1886), *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Berlin).
- (1893), *Aristoteles und Athen* (2 vols.; Berlin).
- (1900), *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker* (Berlin).
- (1901), 'Hieron und Pindaros', *SBBAW* 1273-318; repr. in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1935-72), vi. 234-85.
- (1903), *Timotheus: Die Perser* (Leipzig).
- (1904), 'Sätzungen einer milesischen Sängergilde', *SBBAW* 619-40.
- (1908), 'Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht', *SBBAW*, 328-52; repr. in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1935-72), vi. 286-313.
- (1909), *Nordionische Steine* (APAW).
- (1913), *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin).
- (1916), *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin).
- (1920), *Platon*² (2 vols.; Berlin).
- (1921), *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin).
- (1922), *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- (1935-72), *Kleine Schriften* (6 vols.; Berlin).
- WILKINS, E. G. (1926), 'Μηδὲν ἄγαν in Greek and Latin Literature', *CP* 21: 132-48.
- WILLETS, R. F. (1954), 'The Neotas of Gortyn', *Hermes*, 82: 494-8.
- WILLIAMS, F. (1978), *Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary* (Oxford).
- WILSON, J. A. (1980), 'Καίρος as "Due Measure"', *Glotta*, 58: 177-204.
- WILSON, N. G. (1967), 'A Chapter in the History of Scholia', *CQ* 17: 244-56.
- WINNINGTON-INGRAM, R. P. (1928), 'The Spondeion Scale', *CQ* 22: 83-91.
- (1936), *Mode in Ancient Greek Music* (Cambridge).
- (1963), *Aristides Quintilianus: De Musica* (Oxford).
- (1980), *Sophocles: An Interpretation* (Cambridge).
- WOODBURY, L. (1979), 'Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar *Nem.* 7. 30 ff.', *Phoenix*, 33: 95-133.
- WOODFORD, S. (1983), 'The Iconography of the Infant Herakles Strangling Snakes', in F. Lissarague and F. Thelaman (eds.), *Image et céramique grecque: Actes du colloque de Rouen 1982* (Publications de l'université de Rouen, 96; Rouen), 121-9.
- WORMELL, D. E. W. (1935), 'The Literary Tradition Concerning Hermeias of Atarneus', *YCS* 5: 55-92.

- and PARKE, H. W. (1956), *A History of the Delphic Oracle* (2 vols.; Oxford).
- WUNDERLICH, E. (1925), *Die Bedeutung der roten Farbe im Kulte der Griechen und Römer* (Giessen).
- WÜST, E. (1967), *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter* (Tübingen).
- WYATT, W. (1992), 'The Root of Parmenides', *HSCP* 94: 113–20.
- WYSS, B. (1936), *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae* (Berlin).
- ZABKAR, L. V. (1988), *Hymns to Isis in her Temple at Philae* (Hanover).
- ZANKER, G. (1987), *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience* (London).
- ZIEBARTH, E. (1896), *Das griechische Vereinswesen* (Leipzig).
- ZIEGLER, K. (1908), *De Precationum apud Graecos Forma Quaestiones Selectae* (Bratislava).
- ZIEHEN, L. (1906), *Leges Graecorum Sacrae e Titulis Collectae* (Leipzig).
- (1934), 'Theoroi', *RE* xA. 2239–44.
- ZIMMERMANN, B. (1992), *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung* (Hypomnemata, 98; Göttingen).
- ZUNKER, A. (1988), *Untersuchungen zur Aiakidensage auf Aigina* (Dissertationen, philosophische Reihe, 4; St Ottilien).
- ZUNTZ, G. (1935), 'De Pap. Berol. 13411', *Aegyptus*, 15: 282–96.

Index of Greek Words

- ἀγανός 373
 ἀγανόφρων 367
 ἀγέομαι 202
 ἄγλαια 76 n.
 αἰγλαήρ 76 n.
 ἀγλαΐζω 76 n.
 ἀγλαόθρονος 277 n.
 ἀγλαοπής 76 n.
 ἀγλαός 76
 ἀγλαώπις 76 n.
 ἄδορπον 170
 ἄδυτον 338
 αἰαί 316
 αἰάζω 316
 αἶγλα 76 n.
 αἰσακος 51
 αἰστώ 222
 ἀκήρατος 221
 ἄκοτος 170
 ἀλαλάζω 20
 ἀλαλή 20, 43
 ἀλέξω 308 n.
 ἀλκή 404
 ἀλλότριος 247
 ἀμφιβαίνω 344–5
 ἀμφιθαλής 28, 201, 431
 ἀντιπαιανίζω 19 n.
 αἰοιδίμος 307
 ἀπαίων 50
 ἀπόλλυμι 198
 ἀποστεπτικός 53 n.
 ἀριστόποις 404
 ἄρμενος 385
 ἄρμονία 385 n.
 ἀρχαγέτας 378 n.
 ἀσκλησιασμός 66 n.
 ἀτέλεια 180
 ἀτραπός 195
 βαιός 272
 -βρέντας 366 n.
 βῶρμος 12
 γαμβρός 361
 γανάω 342
 γάνωσις 342 n.
 δαίδαλαμα 221
 δέλτος 250 n.
 δέσμιος 56
 Δηλιασταί 60
 δηλος 251
 διασταλτικός 81 n.
 διθύραμβος 12
 διθυραμβώδης 389
 διώκω 266
 ἐαρινός 38 n.
 ἐάω 290
 ἐγκελεύω 26 n.
 ἐδνός 285 n.
 Ἔκατος 28
 ἐλαχύνωτος 286 n., 438
 ἐλεεῦ 20, 43
 ἐλικάμπυξ 277
 ἐμβατήριος 44
 ἐμίν 168 n., 204
 ἐν 168 n.
 ἐνιαυτός 255, 412
 ἐξάρχω 43
 ἐπαβολέω 328
 ἐπίβατος 76 n., 78 n.
 ἐπικελεύω 26 n.
 ἐπικήδειον 80
 ἐπικώμιος 441
 ἐπινίκιος 45
 ἐπιπαιανίζω 19 n.
 ἐπιτιμή 180
 ἐπιφθεγματικά 69 n., 71 n.
 ἐπίχειρα 408
 ἐπόρνυμι 376
 ἐρανιστής 432
 ἐράομαι 251
 ἐρευνάω 350–1
 ἔρχομαι 381 n.
 ἔτος 432
 εὐαγορία 271 n.
 εὐπλεκής 385
 εὐφήμια 53
 ἔφυμνα 69 n.

ἥϊε 25 n.
 ἡμί 251 n.
 ἡμιόλιον 77
 ἡρώϊος 246
 ἡρωΐς 408–9
 ἡσυχαστικός 81 n.

θάργηλος 256
 θεαρία 408–9
 θέμις 216, 397
 Θεμίονοι 170
 θεμίξενον 170
 θεμισκόπος 314
 θεσπέσιος 341 n.
 Θηβαγενής 356
 θοός 311, 410
 θύεται 170
 θυιαίγιδ' 421

ιάλεμος 12
 ἱαρός 168 n.
 ἱήϊος 25 n., 345–6
 ἱημι 15–16
 ἱηναί 316
 ἱηπαιωνίζω 19 n.
 ἱήτε 316–18
 ἱουλος 12
 ἱπποσόα 195 n.
 ἱσαμι 253
 ἰσόθεος 375
 ἴτω 64, 69 n.

κατάδεσμος 56
 κατακελεύω 26 n.
 κατάρχω 52
 καταχρηστικῶς 105, 362–3
 -κελεύω 26
 κενεός 380
 κεχωρισμένος 159 n.
 κλάζω 235 n.
 Κλεώ 168 n., 242–3
 κλυτόμαντις 204, 216 n.
 κλυτόμητις 41
 κορυφά 235
 κραίνω 196 n.
 κράνιον 401
 κρητικὸς 77 n.
 κτιστός 225
 κῶμος 55 n.

λέγω 366
 λευκόφυλλος 54 n.
 λίνος 12

λιτυέρσης 12
 λίχανος 82 n.
 λυσίμβροτος 221
 μεδέων 324
 μέτρα 316, 320
 μορμόρυξις 401 n.
 μύριος 313

ναύλοχος 426
 ναυπρύτανις 170
 νεόπολις 170
 νόμος 104, 388
 ὀαρίζω 408
 οἰκόθετον 170
 οἶος 383
 ὀλολυγή 19, 368
 ὀνομάκλυτος 168–9
 ὀρειδρόμος 341
 -όρνυμι 374
 Ὀρχησταί 60
 οὐδός 225 n.

παιάν 11, 76
 παιανίαί 60
 παιανίζω 22, 53 n.
 παιανιστής 12 n.
 παιήων 11
 παιών 11, 76
 πᾶν 311
 πανιστής 12 n.
 παραηδών 24 n.
 πάσσαλος 435
 πατρῷος 250 n.
 πεδάω 312 n.
 ποικιλόθρον' 158 n.
 πολυνύμμος 428 n.
 πόνος 249 n.
 πόρος 249 n.
 ποτάομαι 433
 ποτε (introducing narrative) 311, 431
 πράσσω 210
 προβώμιος 203
 προδικία 180
 προεδρία 180
 προμάντεια 180
 προξενία 180
 προοίμιον 91
 Πυθαῖσταί 60
 πύθομαι 24 n.

ῥαθάμιγξ 342 n.

ρήσσω 66
 ῥίπτω 251 n.
 ῥόθιον 170 n., 325
 ῥόθος 170 n., 368
 ῥυθμός 219

σαμαίνω 235 n.
 σκοπή 372
 σοφία 194 n.
 σπονδεῖον 82
 συμπαιανίζω 19 n.
 συνεπηχέω 43, 66 n.
 συσταλτικός 81 n.

Ταντάλιος 239
 τὰς 251 n.
 τεθμός 290
 τελεσίερος 48, 340 n.
 τελεσσειεπής 340 n.
 τελευτή 408 n.
 τέρας 290 n.
 τερπνός 369
 τέως 251 n.
 τηλέφαντος 371

τίθημι 287
 τίκτω 203
 τιτανισμός 44
 τολυπεύω 242
 τόνος 81

ύμέναιος 12
 ύμέτερος 196, 325
 ύμνησις 366 n.
 ύπόκρισις 386, 436

φέγγος 271 n.
 φέρεται 324
 φιλησιστέφανος 170
 φράζομαι 384 n.
 φυή 401 n.

χαλκοθώραξ 169
 χαλκοκορυστής 169
 χάρμα 76
 χοραγός 372
 χόρευσις 366 n.

ώριος 23 n., 277 n.

Index of Passages Cited

- Achilles Tatius:
 3. 32. 2: 45 n.
- Aelian:
HA 8. 4: 54 n.
 11. 1: 279 n.
 12. 30: 405 n.
VH 3. 1: 202 n.
 12. 36: 361 n.
 fr. 19: 131 n.
 fr. 98: 54 n., 66 n.
- Aelius Aristides: 11
Or. 3 Σ 191: 65 n.
Or. 14. 228: 75 n.
Or. 28. 58: 302
Or. 37. 18: 44 n., 367 n.
Or. 40. 4: 48 n.
 21: 11 n., 71, 135-6 n.
Or. 42. 12: 65 n.
Or. 43. 31: 307 n.
Or. 47. 73: 38 n.
Or. 48. 53: 38
Or. 50. 31: 38 n.
 42: 11 n., 136 n.
παῖδες: 464
 prose hymns: 128
- [Aristides], *Peri Aph. Log.* 77. 25: 93
- Aeneas Tacticus 12 n., 43, 116
- Aeschines, *Fals. leg.* 162-3: 67, 93-4
- Aeschylus:
 Paian: 28, 462
 plays:
Ag. 28: 20 n.
 99: 11 n.
 146: 12 n., 70 n.
 156: 235 n.
 201: 235 n.
 245-7: 124, 125 n.
 289: 375 n.
 309: 375 n.
 512: 11 n.
 594-6: 20 n.
 644-5: 120 n.
 683: 366 n.
 1035 ff.: 237 n.
 1066: 11 n.
 1118: 20 n.
 1146: 317 n.
 1152: 235 n.
 1154-5: 341 n.
 1199: 11 n.
 1246-8: 54 n.
- Bassarides*: 198
- Cho.* 149-51: 48 n., 119
 152 ff.: 111 n.
 342-4: 119 n.
 386: 20 n.
 535: 235 n.
- Eum.*: 230
 1 ff.: 396
 3: 216 n.
 9-11: 345 n.
 21: 221 n.
 24 ff.: 29 n.
 306: 56
 331-2: 56
 344-5: 56
 Σ 2: 395
- Pers.* 37: 423 n.
 389 ff.: 35 n.
 392: 71 n.
 392-4: 116
 605: 11 n.
 Σ 938: 384 n.
- Septem*:
 267-9: 20 n., 48, 110
 270: 66 n.
 288 ff.: 32 n., 110
 498: 421 n.
 635: 21 n., 71 n., 134 n.
 836: 421 n.
 869-70: 21 n., 71 n.
 975: 423 n.
- Su.*:
 24 ff.: 50 n.
 69: 384 n.
 212-14: 198 n.

- 247: 308 n.
 364: 421 n.
 786: 375 n.
 1019: 342 n.
TrGF iii:
 fr. 55 (*Epigoni*): 50 n.
 fr. 78 (*Thalamopoiói*): 219 n.
 fr. 161 (*Niobe*): 22 n., 48 n., 49, 121 n.
 fr. 168 (*Xantriai*): 212
 fr. 170 (*Xantriai*): 368 n.
 frr. 190-3 (*Prometheus Lyomenos*): 203 n.
 fr. 255 (*Philoctetes*): 118-19
 fr. 281a. 28: 308 n.
 fr. 341: 134 n.
 fr. 350: 21 n., 56, 59 n., 124, 327 n.; line 4: 54 n., 71 n.
 fr. 351: 404 n.
 fr. 355: 83, 98 n.
Aesop, Oxyrhynchus Life: 315
Agenor of Mytilene: 146
Alcaeus:
 fr. 70. 8: 251 n.
 fr. 206. 6: 251 n.
 fr. 283. 3 ff.: 237 n.
 fr. 307c: 27-8, 54 n., 91, 150 n., 278
 fr. 327. 2-3: 325 n.
SLG 291 (?): 11 n.
Alcman:
παρθένεια: 80 n.
PMG 29: 307 n.
PMG 98: 51, 52 n.
Alexander of Pleuron: 429
Alexinus of Elis: 94, 464
Anacreon:
PMG 358. 2: 325 n.
PMG 361: 286 n.
PMG 504: 271 n.
Anacreontea: 222 n., 386 n.
Andrian Hymn to Isis: 233
Anthologia Graeca:
 2 (*Christodorus*):
 110: 342 n.
 382: 423 n.
 9. 525 (*Anonymous*): 341 n.
 16. 270 (*Marcus*): 385 n.
Antimachus:
 fr. 179: 405 n.
SH 78: 463
Apollodorus:
Bibl.:
 1. 4. 1: 368 n.
 2. 2. 2: 287 n.
 2. 4. 11: 223 n.
 2. 4. 5 ff.: 426 n.
 2. 5. 8: 262 n., 265 n.
 2. 5. 9: 380 n., 381
 3. 12. 5: 236
 3. 12. 6: 416
 3. 12. 9-10: 331 n.
 3. 13. 8: 311 n.
 3. 15. 5-7: 289 n.
 3. 15. 7: 49 n.
Epit. 6. 12: 313 n.
FGrH: 244
 F 90: 14 n.
 F 149: 12 n.
Apollonius of Rhodes:
Argonautica:
 1. 747-51: 426 n.
 1048: 408
 1085 ff.: 359
 2. 701-13: 25 n.
 702: 18 n.
 710: 250 n.
 712: 70 n.
 3. 1178: 423 n.
 4. 1765 ff.: 411 n.
 Σ *Arg.* 1. 186: 291 n.
 972: 23 n.
Aratus of Soli: 143 n.
Phaenomena:
 1 ff. 307 n.
 833 ff. 375 n.
Archilochus:
ἐπινίκιον: 386
IEG 2. 2: 267 n.
 5. 1: 271
 38. 11 (= *POxy* 2317): 328 n.
 116: 290
 120: 98 n.
 121: 66, 79 n., 286 n., 385
 122: 193
 324 (*Kallinikos*): 136, 386
Ariphron, παίδν: 37, 50, 73
Aristarchus: 25 n., 90, 149, 237, 321, 319 n.
Aristides Quintilianus: 80
 1. 16: 77 n.
Aristocles, SH 206: 308
Aristodemus: 149, 259, 321
Aristonikos: 149, 201, 206 n., 239, 306
Aristonoos, παίδν: 28, 90-1
 1-8: 74 n.
 4-5: 385 n.

- Aristonoos (*cont.*):
 5-6: 250 n.
 19 ff.: 221 n.
 27-8: 309
 41-8: 75 n.
 refrain: 70
- Aristophanes, comedian:
Acharnians:
 1212-13: 19, 37 n., 118
Birds:
 575: 247 n.
 742: 341 n.
 769: 278 n.
 851 ff.: 64
 858: 66 n.
 869: 278 n.
 1273: 26 n.
 1737: 431 n.
 1763: 19 n., 21 n., 56
 Σ 853: 156 n.
 Σ 930: 168 n.
Clouds
 599: 226 n.
 1357-8: 176
 Σ 967: 193 n.
Frogs
 52: 176
 207: 26 n.
 382 ff.: 404
 464: 416 n.
 530: 380 n.
 952: 389 n.
 1243: 389 n.
 Σ 1080: 203 n.
Knights
 85 ff.: 50 n.
 408: 19 n.
 561: 345 n.
 1316 ff.: 53
 1327: 20 n.
 1328: 19 n.
Lys.
 393: 317
 1281-2: 70 n.
 1291: 19 n., 21 n.
Peace
 47: 20 n.
 96-7: 20 n.
 453 ff.: 14 n., 19, 43 n., 55, 117
 555: 19 n., 55
Plutos
 636: 11 n.
 1132: 50 n.
- Σ 636: 153 n.
Thesm.
 129: 345 n.
 295 ff.: 53
 311: 19 n., 76 n.
 315 ff.: 276
 320: 428 n.
 1034 ff.: 56
 1311: 19 n.
Wasps
 525: 50 n.
 771-2: 318 n.
 869 ff.: 53
 874: 70 n.
 1184: 382
PCG iii/2
 fr. 322 (*Heroes*): 409 n.
- Aristophanes by Byzantium: 443
 fr. 123: 265
 fr. 340: 12 n.
 fr. 381: 146
- Aristotle:
Ath. Pol. 54. 7: 298 n.
 Epigram for Hermias: 93 n.
 fragments:
 fr. 3: 212, 232
 fr. 488: 251 n.
 Hermias-song: 57, 90, 92-3
Mund. 3, 393^a14: 295
NE 10. 7. 1, 1177^a12-18: 409 n.
Po. 4, 1449^a10-12: 102
Pol. 8. 7. 11, 1342^b: 80 n., 133 n.
Problems
 19. 15, 918^b13: 103 n.
 19. 48, 922^a10-14: 80 n.
Rhet. 3. 8. 4-6, 1409^a: 11 n., 77 n.
- Aristoxenus:
 fr. 80: 360
 fr. 82: 80
 fr. 117: 38, 54 n., 383 n.
- Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*:
 1, 20 E: 45 n.
 4, 141 E-F: 32 n.
 6, 234 D: 297 n.
 250 B: 45 n., 462
 250 C: 463
 253 B: 65 n.
 253 C: 106 n.
 11, 372 A: 310
 13, 464 F: 37, 82
 14, 619 B: 23 n.
 625 B-E: 384 n.
 15, 672 C: 405 n.

678 c: 31 n., 460
 694 c: 96 n., 97 n.
 695 E: 58 n.
 696 A: 462
 696 A-697 B: 92 n., 94
 696 F: 49, 57
 701 D: 25 n.
 701 E-F: 19 n.
 701 F-702 B: 38 n., 96 n.
 Athenaios, *παιάν*: 35, 81

Baccheius, 309. 9 Jan: 384 n.
 Bacchylides:

- 1: 284, 288
 112 ff.: 289 n.
 138: 289 n.
 - 2: 283 n.
 11 ff.: 286 n.
 - 3: 24: 380 n.
 37 ff.: 290 n.
 71: 366 n.
 - 5: 14: 296 n.
 20: 233
 192: 296 n.
 - 6: 284
 5: 287 n.
 - 7: 284
 - 8: 284
 12: 287 n.
 15: 286 n.
 - 9: 1: 277 n.
 11: 151 n.
 - 13: 180 ff.: 216 n.
 - 15: 288 n.
 9: 424 n.
 49: 428 n.
 - 16: 8-9: 28, 25, 316, 324, 366 n.
 - 17: 29 n., 35-6, 55, 72, 98, 155,
 167 n., 284
 66: 366 n.
 128-9: 368
 130-2: 75 n.
 end: 334
 - 18: 412
 24: 380 n.
- Cassandra*: 237
Epigr. 1. 1: 428 n.
 fr. 2: 317 n.
 Paianes: 460
 fr. 4: 31, 62, 75 n., 79, 173, 285
 63: 366 n.
 65 ff.: 37 n.

75 ff.: 255
 77 ff.: 110 n.
 Partheneia: 80 n.
 fr. 14: 410 n.
 fr. 20-20E: 157 n.
 fr. 20B 5: 206 n.
 fr. 20D Σ: 361 n.
 fr. 21: 414 n.
 fr. 33: 410 n.
 fr. 60. 36: 71 n.
 37: 71, 98
 fr. 60-1: 140, 435
 fr. 63. 1: 296 n.
 fr. 64: 143 n.

Callimachus:

Aitia:
 fr. 1:
 21 ff.: 250 n.
 25 ff.: 247 n.
 fr. 18. 6: 18 n., 70 n.
 fr. 23. 3: 428
 fr. 67. 5: 291
 fr. 75. 60: 20 n.
 64 ff.: 289
 67: 289 n.
 70 ff.: 291
 fr. 87: 65 n.
 fr. 89: 204 n.
 fr. 114: 121 n.
 fr. 118: 217 n.
 fr. 229 (*Brankhos*): 128
 fr. 450: 147
 fr. 494: 325 n.
 fr. 517: 88 n.
 fr. 593: 29 n.
 fr. 643: 89 n.
 fr. 669: 384 n.
 fr. 675: 428
Hecale:
 fr. 260. 10: 18 n., 345 n.
 fr. 302: 198 n.
Humnoi:
 2: 31, 129, 355
 20-5: 122
 22 ff.: 361 n.
 61: 309
 81: 255
 97-104: 25 n., 318 n.
 102: 71 n.
 103: 18 n.
 4: 367 n.

Callimachus, *Humnoi* (cont.):

- 27: 309 n.
 53 ff.: 251 n.
 132: 368 n.
 204: 196 n., 368 n.
 215: 404 n.
 227: 196 n.
 249 ff.: 278 n.
 257: 368 n., 369 n.
 258: 278 n.
 314-15: 297 n.
 321-4: 65 n.

- 5: 5, 404
 72: 278 n.
 139: 20 n.
 6. 1: 71 n.
 118: 71 n.

Iamboi:

- fr. 198 = *Iambus* 8: 325 n., 411 n.
 fr. 217: 64 n.

SH 254 (Victoria Berenices):

- A 1: 285
SH 293: 90, 237

Callisthenes of Olynthus: 95

Cleanthes: 366 n., 428 n.

Clearchus of Soli, fr. 64: 19 n., 25 n.

Cleonides, *Isag.*:

198. 13-17 Jan: 384 n.
 206. 3 ff. Jan: 80 n.

comic fragments:

CGF:

- Epicharmus, *CGF* fr. 87, 1: 432 n.
 Sophron, *CGF* fr. 156: 317 n.

PCG:

- Alexis, *PCG* ii, fr. 116: 96
 Antiphanes, *PCG* ii, fr. 147: 96 n.
 Cratinus, *PCG* iv. 242, fr. 237: 24,
 25 n., 77 n.
 Nicostratus, *PCG* vii, fr. 18: 96 n.
 Pherecrates, *PCG* vii, fr. 138:
 50 n., 71 n.
 Philetaerus, *PCG* vii, fr. 1: 96 n.
 Strattis, *PCG* vii, fr. 23: 50 n.
 Xenarchus, *PCG* viii, fr. 2: 50 n.

Cornutus: 20 n.

Corpus Hippocraticum:

- De articulis* 43: 219 n.
Epidemics 3. 7: 267
Hippiatrica Berolinensia: 25 n.

Crates of Mallos: 12 n.

Cydias:

- PMG* 715: 193

Demetrius of Phaleron: 55 n.

Demosthenes:

18. 287: 55 n.
 19. 128: 19 n.

Diagoras of Melos: 123

Dicaearchus fr. 88 W: 51

Didymus:

1. 5. 22, 44: 30 n.
 2. 5. 58, 238-9: 356
 4. 9. 3, 389: 92 n.
 4. 9. 5, 390: 14 n.
ὑπόμνημα τὸ τῶν Παιάνων τοῦ Πινδάρου: 137 n., 149, 356

Diodorus:

2. 48: 279 n.
 3. 61. 1: 331 n.
 4. 7: 366 n.
 4. 72. 5: 325 n.
 5. 29. 4: 19 n., 71 n.
 5. 79. 2: 380 n.
 11. 44: 263 n.
 12. 78: 31 n.
 15. 7: 335 n.
 16. 26: 229 n.
 16. 30: 395 n.
 20. 16. 4: 45 n.

Diogenes Laertius:

2. 43: 91
 2. 44: 368 n.
 5. 6: 92 n.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus:

- Ant. Rom.* 8. 55: 55 n.
Dem. Lex. 7: 148

[Dionysius], *Rhet.* 10. 9 (366. 8 U-R): 94 n.Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica*:

- Supplement* i. 113-14 Uhlig: 140 n.
 Σ 450. 19-20: 352 n.
 Σ 451. 12: 36 n.
 17 ff.: 156 n.

Ennius fr. 17-18: 236 n.

Epic Cycle:

- Aithiopis*: 312
Iliou Persis: 313

Erythraean *παιᾶνες*:

- to Apollo:
 11: 74 n.
 13: 256
 18: 385 n.
 to Asclepius: 39, 73
 1: 76 n.
 13: 76 n.

- 19-20: 76 n.
to Seleukos: 57 n., 78
2: 276
- Euphorion:
fr. 14: 88 n.
fr. 85: 70 n.
fr. 119: 289 n.
SH 119: 289 n.
- Euripides:
plays:
Alc.:
31: 14 n.
64: 14 n.
92: 37 n.
220: 37 n.
220-6: 14, 120 n.
422 ff.: 120
445 ff. 31
Alexandros:
hypothesis 237 n.
Andr.:
50-4: 323
296: 341
Ba.:
298 ff.: 133
526: 12 n.
625: 404 n.
985: 341
El.:
435: 386 n.
693: 20 n.
843: 20 n.
1210: 70 n.
Erechth.:
fr. 65. 5: 21 n.
fr. 65. 6: 19 n.
Hec.:
90: 236
Σ 458: 368 n.
Hel.:
1451-5: 386
Her.: 401
348-9: 122 n.
391: 380 n.
643 ff.: 286 n.
687 ff.: 29 n., 59, 114
692: 278 n.
695: 92 n.
815 ff.: 125 n.
820: 37 n.
Hipp.:
1201: 35 n.
- Hrcld.*:
981: 20 n.
- Hyps.*:
fr. 1. iii. 9: 45 n., 70 n.
- IA*:
548: 325 n.
798: 250 n.
1467 ff. 23 n., 54 n., 59, 65,
115 n.
1492: 71 n.
- Ion*:
82 ff.: 111
125-7 = 141-3: 54, 59, 70, 111
128 ff.: 112
162: 278 n.
222-4: 395
- IT*:
21: 368 n.
1039-41: 405
1098 ff.: 366 n.
1104 ff.: 278 n.
1199: 405
1234 ff.: 396
1239 ff.: 27
1259 ff.: 216 n.
1403-4: 21 n., 26 n., 37 n., 45 n.,
54 n., 71 n.
- Or.*:
163-5: 216 n.
Σ 1646: 206 n.
- Pho.*:
3: 318 n.
3 ff.: 199 n.
335: 20 n.
636: 366 n.
1026-7: 70
Σ 1102: 153 n.
- Su.*:
135: 356 n.
719: 20 n.
- Tro.*:
126: 45 n., 79 n.
483: 313 n.
529: 124 n.
577 ff.: 125-6
675: 221 n.
922: 236 n.
1061: 277 n.
- TGF*:
fr. 122 (*Andromeda*): 56
fr. 436 (*Auge*): 203 n.
fr. 477 (*Likymnius*): 133 n.,
385 n.

- Euripides, *TGF* (cont.):
 fr. 713 (*Telephus*): 325 n.
 fr. 862: 256 n.
 fr. 1014: 308 n.
Peirithoos [Euripides/Critias], fr.
 1: 416 n.
- Galen on Hippocrates, *De articulis* 43:
 219 n.
- Gaudentius, 347. 10 Jan: 384 n.
- Heliodorus, *Aith.*:
 1. 10: 47
 2. 34-3. 3: 323 n.
 3. 5: 21 n.
 3. 5. 2: 20 n.
 4. 19: 175 n.
- Hephaestius 158 n.
- Enkh.*:
 23. 14 ff.: 449
 42. 7: 77 n., 461
 42. 23: 77 n., 100 n.
- Peri Poiematon*:
 65. 1: 103 n.
 68. 16 ff.: 147
 70-1: 71 n.
 71. 16: 69 n.
 74. 12: 147
- Peri Semeion*:
 74. 5: 140 n.
- Σ Choeroboscus:
 249. 2: 77 n.
 303. 20: 100 n.
- Heracleides of Pontus: 99
 fr. 158: 19 n., 79
 fr. 163: 384
- Hermippus the Callimachean, fr. 48:
 93 n.
- Hermocles of Cyzicus: 57 n.
- Herodian: 428 n., 429 n.
- Herodotus:
 1. 51: 28 n.
 92: 221 n.
 165: 269 n.
 168: 264 n., 269 n.
 2. 44: 115 n.
 49: 134 n.
 54-7: 352
 79: 12 n.
 108: 286 n.
 131: 424 n.
 3. 108: 366 n.
 4. 33-4: 246 n.
 33. 5: 369 n.
 35: 284
 37: 287 n.
 189: 20 n.
 5. 1: 43, 116, 271
 59: 426 n.
 80-1: 414
 89: 415 n.
 6. 8: 262 n.
 7. 110: 266 n.
 126: 265 n., 272 n.
 204: 291 n.
 8. 37-9: 221 n.
 46: 295
 64: 414
 83: 414
 120: 263
- Hesiod:
Op.:
 proem: 307 n.
 70-2: 219 n.
 122-3: 409 n.
 145: 341
 150: 224
 412: 320 n.
 448: 359 n.
 595: 404 n.
 694: 320
 811: 233
- The.*:
 4: 279 n.
 60: 365 n.
 74: 365 n.
 187: 341
 200: 318 n.
 408: 367
 530: 356 n.
 571-2: 219
 775-806: 203 n.
 815: 233
 901 ff. 255
 947 ff.: 325 n.
- [Hesiod]:
Aspis:
 19 ff.: 426
 306: 370 n., 385
 428: 212
 hypothesis: 324
- Ehoiai*:
 fr. 31: 204
 fr. 195: 324
 fr. 250: 414
 fr. 307: 11 n.

- Melampodia*: 174, 288
- Hesychius:
 Latte:
 1. 24: 76 n.
 1. 59: 415 n.
 1. 62: 76 n.
 1. 394: 65 n.
 2. 64: 43
 2. 293: 405 n.
 2. 537: 389 n.
 Schmidt:
 3. 253: 11 n., 48, 55 n., 131 n.,
 153 n., 340 n., 355
 3. 300: 354 n.
 4. 22: 202 n.
 4. 135: 251 n.
 4. 139: 48
 4. 211: 369 n.
 4. 216. 6: 367 n.
- Himerius:
 12. 29: 48 n., 115 n. 65
 14. 10-11: 27, 91, 278
 62. 54: 278, 460
 68. 23: 221
- Hippocrates: see *Corpus Hippocraticum*
 historical fragments:
 Andron of Halicarnassus, *FGrH* 10
 F 20 (Addenda): 206
 Autesion, *FGrH* 298 F 1: 431
 Demochares, *FGrH* 75 F 2: 57, 106
 Duris:
FGrH 76 F 27: 58 n.
 F 71: 58
 F 79: 25 n.
- Ephorus:
FGrH 70 F 21: 355
 F 31: 25, 26, 71 n.
 F 31b: 202
 F 119: 429 n.
 F 149: 25 n., 78 n.
 F 311: 202 n.
- Epimenides, *FGrH* 457: 214
 Gorgon of Rhodes, *FGrH* 515 F 19:
 57, 464 n.
- Hellánikos, *FGrH* 4 F 104: 265
 Istros, *FGrH* 334 F 40-2: 431
 Nymphis of Heracleia, *FGrH* 432 F
 5: 13 n.
- Pherecydes:
FGrH 3 F 13a-b: 426 n.
 F 102: 268 n.
 F 120: 27 n.
- Philochorus:
FGrH 328 F 7: 88 n.
 F 75: 64 n., 298 n.
 F 165: 57 n.
 F 172: 37, 82
 F 216: 52 n.
- Polycrates, *FGrH* 588 F 1: 30 n.,
 80 n.
- Sosibius, *FGrH* 595 F 23: 100
 Suidas of Thessaly, *FGrH* 602 F
 11: 429 n.
- Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 80:
 202 n.
- Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F 92: 463
 Xenomedes of Ceos, *FGrH* 142 H
 4: 289 n.
- FHG*:
 Callixeinus, *FHG* 3. 58: 255
 Favorinus, *FHG* 3. 581, fr. 28:
 93 n.
 Glaukos of Rhegium, *FHG* 2. 24,
 fr. 4: 146, 383
 Mnaseas of Patara, *FHG* 3. 157,
 fr. 47: 357
- Homer:
Il.
 1. 37: 345 n.
 37 ff.: 273 n.
 283 ff.: 312 n.
 451: 345 n.
 472-4: 13, 15
 2. 755: 202
 93: 359
 4. 154: 66 n.
 5. 401: 11
 785: 273 n.
 899: 11
 6. 262: 308 n.
 8. 51-2: 366 n.
 11. 182-3: 366 n.
 13. 178: 341 n.
 523 ff.: 313 n.
 15. 26: 380 n.
 365: 25 n.
 16. 234: 428, 429 n.
 432 ff.: 312
 18. 222: 273 n.
 233: 273 n.
 19. 301: 66
 22. 5: 312 n.
 93-5: 320
 178: 366 n.
 359: 312 n.

- Homer, *Il.* (*cont.*):
 391: 362
 391-2: 125
 23. 148: 277 n.
 436: 385 n.
- Od.*:
 3. 188 ff.: 313 n.
 450: 20 n.
 4. 8 ff.: 313 n.
 231: 11
 601 ff.: 286 n.
 5. 239: 424 n.
 456: 222 n.
 6. 232-4: 219 n.
 7. 86 ff.: 227
 136 ff.: 50 n.
 8. 367: 277 n.
 9. 196 ff.: 267 n.
 198: 345 n.
 11. 514: 202 n.
 12. 189-92: 220
 16. 403: 397 n.
 22. 297: 221 n.
 348: 24 n.
 23. 3: 369 n.
 159-61: 219 n.
 24. 403: 359
- Σ:
Il.:
 1. 473: 105 n.
 2. 533: 262 n.
 12. 211: 311 n.
 15. 522: 311 n.
 16. 234-5: 429 n.
 19. 236: 311 n.
- Od.*:
 3. 267: 202 n.
 8. 294: 271 n.
 12. 266: 426 n.
- Homeric Hymns*:
 Aphrodite:
 19: 420
 59: 277 n.
 196 ff. and 296 ff.: 204
- Apollo:
 Delian: 247
 17-18: 366 n.
 26: 366 n.
 62: 250 n.
 82: 428 n.
 87-8: 277 n.
 119: 368 n.
 141: 366 n.
- 157: 29 n.
 Pythian:
 51 ff.: 286 n.
 296-9: 223
 360: 341 n.
 516-19: 13, 24, 59, 64, 66
 narration of Apollo's take-over
 of Delphi: 396
 Demeter, 18: 428 n.
 Helios, 9-16: 194 n.
 Hermes:
 247: 340 n.
 309-10: 196 n.
 12. 2: 404
 introductory formulas 74
- Horace:
Odes:
 1. 15: 237
 37: 114 n.
 4. 2: 36, 148 n.
 6. 29: 324 n.
Carmen Saeculare: 33
 Hyperides, *Deliaikos*: 29 n., 367 n.
- Iamblichus:
De myst. 73: 229 n.
Vita Pythagorea:
 25. 110. 8: 54
 111-12: 82 n.
- Ibycus:
PMG 282:
 23 ff.: 250 n.
 end: 410
PMG 286:
 4: 221 n.
- inscriptions:
CID:
 1:
 no. 7: 33 n.
 no. 9: 133
 3: 34
DGEPP:
 325: 243 n.
FD:
 3. 2:
 nos. 2-51: 34
 no. 78: 308 n., 464
 no. 137: 34
 no. 138: 34
 no. 257: 34
- IC*:
 1, xvii: 464
 2. 72: 412 n.

- ID:*
 290: 404 n.
 1506: 380 n.
 2539: 284
- IG:*
 I (2):
 771: 462
 I (3):
 474, face A, col. ii, fr. ii. 187:
 219 n.
 2 (2):
 1078: 64
 1258: 206 n.
 2481: 60
 2963: 61
 3092: 38 n.
 4467: 110
 4494: 465
 4514: 465
 4533: 42, 70 n., 341 n., 465
 4:
 748: 408
 755: 334 n.
 4. I (2):
 128: 41
 132: 38 n.
 132-4: 42, 54, 145
 133: 466
 135: 466
 5. I
 209: 60
 209-12: 465
 1314: 465
 5. 2:
 271. 8: 206 n.
 12. I:
 155: 12 n.
 719: 243 n.
 12. 5:
 48: 366 n.
 210: 367 n.
 544: 284 n.
 608: 286 n.
 12. 7
 418: 60 n.
 12. 8:
 358 (a): 22 n., 49, 131 n.
 14:
 1059: 61 n.
 1084: 61
- LSAM*
 no. 24: 39, 146 n.
 34-5: 21
- no. 50: 59, 60 n.
 12: 22 n.
 17 ff.: 292
 28 ff.: 22, 462
- LSCGS*
 no. 38: 33 n.
 no. 41: 310 n.
 no. 115: 243 n.
- ML:*
 30: 63, 64 n., 268
- SEC:*
 80: 31 n., 463
- SEG:*
 4. 85: 276
 467: 276
 23. 126: 42 n.
 24. 66: 462
 26. 44: 462
 28. 225: 39 n.
 31. 985: 268 n.
 32. 232: 61
 35. 253: 11 n.
- SGUA:*
 1. 5803: 61 n.
 3. 7090: 61 n.
- SIG:*
 57: 59, 60 n.
 12. 22 n.
 17 ff.: 292
 28 ff.: 22, 63, 462
 450: 310 n., 464
 579: 310
 696-8: 34
 711: 34, 325 n.
 728: 34
 1110: 61
 1268: 210
 others: 11 n., 60 n., 243 n., 310 n.,
 332 n.
- Isidorus: 72 n.
 Isocrates: 331 n., 416 n.
 Isodemus of Trozen: 61
 Isyllus, *παίαν*: 41, 73
 1-2: 74 n.
 41-57: 75 n.
 46: 76 n.
 48: 276
 52 ff.: 169 n., 369 n.
 58: 76 n.
 59-61: 76 n.

- Joh. Sard. on Aphth. *Progymn.*, ed.
 Rabe:
 119. 21-3: 100 n.
 120. 3 ff.: 153 n.
 120. 9 ff.: 156 n.
- Lasus of Hermione, *PMG* 702: 385 n.
- lexica:
EGen:
 (A): 411 n.
EM:
 243. 3: 31 n.
 252. 118: 405 n.
 255. 17: 206 n.
 298. 1: 206 n.
 394. 33: 292 n.
 436. 49: 405 n.
 469. 43: 25 n.
 504. 9: 64 n.
 517. 25: 242
 657. 11: 14 n.
 690. 25: 106 n.
 690. 33 ff., 40 ff.: 156 n.
 690. 41: 106 n.
 699. 56: 367 n.
 777. 4 ff.: 156 n.
 9: 92 n.
- Gud*:
 Sturz:
 31. 30: 64 n.
 326. 3: 242
 446. 51: 14 n.
- Libanius:
 20. 2: 179
 64. 13: 65 n.
- Limenios, *παίδν*, 4: 276
- Lucan, 1. 678 ff.: 237 n.
- Lucian:
Alethon Diegematon A': 72 n.
Am. 13: 221 n.
De dea Syra:
 12-16, 19-27: 217
 33: 405 n.
 47: 405 n.
De salt. 16: 100 n.
Sump. 16: 380 n.
 [Dem. Enc.] 27: 39 n., 40
 Σ *Dial. Mort.* 10: 224 n.
- Lycophron:
 327: 320 n.
 354: 256
 401: 252 n.
 824 ff.: 236
- Σ 132 and 136: 235 n.
 Σ 208: 206 n.
 Σ 440: 265
- lyric fragments:
ALG:
 Ps.-Phokylides fr. 4: 286 n.
- GRDK*:
 51. 4-5: 368 n.
 52. 273 n.
 and metre: 79
- PMG*:
 767: 35, 459, 461
 851b. 4-5: 74, 221 n.
 858: 44 n., 70 n.
 884-7: 97 n.
 895-6: 96 n.
 922: 13, 238, 465 n.
 936 (Epidaurian hymn to Pan):
 463 n.
 15: 342
 end: 71
 937: 78
 939. 5 (Ps.-Arion): 386 n.
 950 (a) and (b): 461
 998: 379
 1001: 328
 1018 (b): 37 n.
 1019: 249 n.
 1031: 77 n., 462
 1035: 170, 465
- SLG*:
 460: 69 n., 284
- Macedonicus, *παίδν*: 40-1
 2: 54, 296 n.
 4: 59 n.
 6: 14, 31 n. 341 n.
 25-32: 75 n.
- Menander, *Dysc.* 230-1: 12
- Menander Rhetor: 100 n., 198 n.
- Mesomedes:
 1. 8-9: 122 n.
 2. 1: 278 n.
 2. 1 ff.: 278
 2. 21 ff.: 277 n., 279
 3. 1 ff.: 216 n.
- Michael Akominatos, 2. 14. 15: 264 n.
- Mimnermus (*IEG*):
 11. 5 ff.: 255
 20: 193
- minor tragedians (*TrGF*):
 Achaëus, 1. 20 (*Moirai*): 386: 404 n.
 Phrynichus, T 11: 33 n., 45 n.

- Anonymous, 2 adesp. F 621: 39 n. 2448 (=Π²⁴): 138, 163, 364, 388, 433
- Nicander: 2449 (=Π²⁷): 389
 fr. 116: 289
 Heteroiumena: 283 n.
 Ther. 439: 11 n.
 685: 11 n.
- Nonnus: 3822 (=Π²⁵): 138, 212, 364, 376
 5. 340-1: 196 n.
 18. 36: 289 n.
 37. 127: 221 n.
 40. 391: 11 n.
- Oppian: *PSI*:
 Hal. 6. 294: 45 n.
 Cyn. 1. 6: 404 n.
- Orphica: 2. 147(=Π²): 138, 340, 433
 OF fr. 172: 198 n.
 Orphic Hymns:
 35. 2: 404 n.
 52. 11: 133 n.;
- Ovid: 10. 1181: 71, 140, 435
 AA 2. 1 ff.: 72 n.
 Ibis 475: 289 n.
 Met. 5. 261: 279
- Pantacles: 33 n., 462
- papyri:
 Greek magical: 128, 206 n.
 PBerol:
 11677 (=Π⁷): 434
 13411 (=Π⁸): 420
 21114 (=Π⁷): 434
 POsl 1478: 278
 POxy:
 408(=Π¹¹): 138, 364
 659: 462 n.
 675: 61 n.
 841(=Π⁴): 137, 189
 1787: 165 n.
 1788: 165 n.
 1791 (=Π⁹): 212
 1792 (=Π⁷): 162, 163, 364, 398, 417, 433
 1800: 315 n.
 2317: 328 n.
 2368: 237
 2438: 147
 2440 (=Π²⁸): 137, 242, 364
 2441 (=Π²⁹): 164, 433
 2442 (=Π²⁶): 164, 364, 399, 433
 2445: 165 n.
- Pausanias:
 1. 2. 5: 47 n.
 1. 34. 3: 47 n.
 1. 37. 6 ff.: 65 n.
 1. 39. 6: 416 n.
 1. 44. 9: 331 n.
 2. 3. 3: 24 n.
 2. 3. 6: 334 n.
 2. 7. 5: 31 n., 416
 2. 29. 6: 414
 2. 29. 7 ff.: 331 n.
 2. 29. 9: 411 n.
 2. 30. 3: 24 n., 411 n.
 2. 30. 4: 332 n.
 2. 33. 2: 29 n.
 2. 38. 2-3: 405
 3. 11. 9: 31
 3. 18. 3: 353 n.
 3. 21. 8: 353 n.
 5. 10. 4: 219 n.
 5. 13. 11: 381 n.
 6. 26. 1: 421 n.
 7. 3. 6: 268 n.
 8. 16. 5: 381 n.
 8. 21. 3: 369 n.
 8. 27. 4: 46 n.
 8. 36. 4: 46 n.
 9. 10. 2: 344
 9. 10. 2-6: 201 n.
 9. 10. 5: 197 n.
 9. 12. 3: 461
 9. 12. 5: 297 n.
 9. 16. 1: 353 n., 354
 9. 26. 1: 196 n.
 9. 27. 2: 369 n.
 9. 27. 5: 279 n.
 10. 5. 6: 29 n.
 10. 5. 9: 225
 10. 5. 9-12: 231
 10. 5. 11: 226
 10. 5. 12: 212, 217

Pausanias (*cont.*):

10. 5. 13: 223
 10. 7. 2: 24 n.
 10. 8. 5: 91
 10. 8. 6: 221 n.
 10. 16. 2: 393
 10. 19. 4: 135
 10. 19. 5: 24 n.
 10. 26. 4: 319
 10. 27. 2: 237 n.

Philammon of Delphi: 27

Philodamus, παιάν: 131-6

- 1: 12 n.
 1-5: 74 n.
 13: 76 n.
 14-62: 75 n.
 36: 373 n.
 61: 76 n.
 62: 52 n.
 105-43: 75 n.
 144: 328 n.
 144-56: 76 n.
 refrain: 69 n., 70

Philostratus:

Vit. Ap.:

1. 25: 219 n.
 5. 4: 131 n.

Apoll. Ep. 78. 2: 239 n.*Ep.* 53: 190*Imag.*:

2. 25: 267 n.
 2. 12: 65 n.
 415: 41, 461 n.

Philoxenus, *PMG* 826: 80 n., 134 n.

Photius:

Lex., ed. Naber:

1. 428: 401 n.
 273: 256 n.

Pindar:

Daphnephorikon, (?) fr. 104b: 179 n.*Dithuramboi*:

- II (fr. 70b): 204
 1: 167 n.
 III (fr. 70c), 16-17: 250 n.
 IV (fr. 70d): 165 n.
 fr. 75:
 3: 277 n.
 14-15: 373 n.
 fr. 86a: 145 n.

Enkomia:

- fr. 122. 15: 410
 fr. 123. 1: 290
 fr. 124 (a): 384

*Epinikia**Ol.* 1: 146, 159 n.

- 29: 221 n.
 38: 432 n.
 52: 249 n.
 97 ff.: 271 n.
 105: 221 n.
 end: 410

Ol. 2:

- 12: 345 n.
 61: 224 n.
 89: 290 n.
 Σ 27: 146 n.
 Σ 13: 431
 Σ 38: 357

Ol. 3: 425

- 13: 431 n.
 16: 296 n.
 26: 195, 435
 end: 210 n.
 Σ 22: 431
 Σ 23: 431

Ol. 4: 288 n.*Ol.* 5, end: 210 n.*Ol.* 6:

- 13: 229 n.
 17: 431 n.
 28: 412
 42 ff.: 41
 69: 290 n.
 94: 272 n.

Ol. 7:

- 33: 431 n.
 54: 366 n.
 68: 235 n.
 77 ff.: 408
 78: 380 n.
 86: 411 n.
 Σ 86: 411 n.

Ol. 8: 326 n.

- 18: 197 n.
 22: 325 n.
 25: 290 n.
 33: 309 n.
 48 ff.: 415

Ol. 9: 178 n.

- 1 ff.: 136, 386
 9: 431 n.
 10: 431
 43: 366 n.
 49: 366 n.
 80: 247 n.
 93: 381 n.

- Ol.* 10:
 15: 380 n.
 24: 397 n.
 29: 380 n.
 45: 375
 51: 251 n.
 104: 431 n.
 Σ 13: 383
Ol. 13
 18: 98 n.
 20-2: 219 n.
 48: 320 n.
 52 ff.: 426 n.
 96: 277 n.
Ol. 14:
 9 ff.: 277 n.
 10: 276
 12: 404 n.
Pyth. 1:
 1: 366 n.
 16: 431 n.
 17: 428 n.
 39: 273 n.
 81: 320 n.
 98: 408 n.
Pyth. 2:
 6: 252 n.
 12: 197 n.
 16: 276
 34: 320 n.
 63: 380 n.
 64: 327 n.
 65: 197 n.
 91: 254
 Σ introduction: 147 n.
 Σ 69: 100
Pyth. 3. 80: 235 n.
Pyth. 4:
 2: 412
 4: 178 n.
 9 ff.: 288
 16: 353, 355
 28-9: 287 n.
 40 ff.: 236
 53: 178 n.
 53 ff.: 236
 60: 354 n.
 113: 287 n.
 115: 428 n.
 205: 168
 247: 247 n.
 270-1: 12 n.
 291: 203 n.
 Σ 3: 397
 Σ 4: 394 n.
Pyth. 5: 31 n.
 20: 309 n.
 60: 380 n.
 63 ff.: 173
 76: 68 n.
 77 ff.: 355
 90 ff.: 342 n.
Pyth. 6: 164 n.
 8: 178 n.
 opening: 307 n.
 Σ 5: 358
Pyth. 8:
 17 ff.: 396
 18 ff.: 296 n.
 22 ff.: 327 n.
 29-30: 196 n.
 39: 431 n.
 57: 342 n.
 58: 309 n.
 78: 320 n.
Pyth. 9:
 5: 431 n.
 15: 431 n.
 39 ff.: 204 n.
 53: 353
 59: 203 n.
 78: 320 n.
 88-9: 366 n.
 98: 277 n.
Pyth. 10:
 6: 441 n.
 67: 410 n.
Pyth. 11:
 4: 340 n.
 5: 356
 9-10: 216 n.
 38: 247
 Σ 5: 340 n.
Pyth. 12:
 25: 279 n.
 Σ 25: 358
 hypothesis to *Pythians*:
 2. 10 ff.: 26 n.
 4. 10: 102, 205
Isth. 1:
 1 ff.: 426 n.
 38: 197 n.
 61-4: 316 n.
Isth. 2:
 33-4: 250 n.
 43: 220 n.

Pindar (*cont.*):*Isth.* 4:

3: 267 n.

19: 197 n.

35: 404 n.

41 ff.: 216 n.

56: 233

70: 311 n.

Isth. 5:

1: 428 n.

23: 276 n.

33: 195

Isth. 6:

1 ff.: 50-1, 95

21: 342 n.

22 ff.: 216 n.

31: 380 n.

52 ff.: 204 n., 326

62: 385 n.

 Σ : 50 n., 414 n.*Isth.* 7: 23: 366 n.*Isth.* 8:

5: 309 n.

23-4: 326, 416

36 ff.: 326

57: 221 n.

63-5: 250 n.

Isth. 9:

1: 224 n.

5 ff.: 325 n.

Isth. fr. 3: 223 n.*Nem.* 1: 288 n.

1 ff.: 74 n.

2: 252 n.

18: 320 n.

36: 367 n.

Nem. 2: 386

1 ff.: 307 n.

 Σ 11: 242*Nem.* 3:

4: 325 n.

11: 408 n.

12: 250 n., 428 n.

22: 311 n.

26: 290 n.

31: 288 n.

32 ff.: 327 n.

38: 404 n.

69-70: 334

Nem. 4:

12: 325 n.

25: 431 n.

26: 380 n.

51 ff.: 323 n.

69: 247 n.

71: 249 n.

82-3: 410 n.

86: 197 n.

 Σ 22: 414 n.*Nem.* 5: 307 n.

8: 325 n.

53: 415 n.

78 and Σ : 411 n.*Nem.* 6:

32: 441 n.

32 ff.: 425 n.

37 ff.: 277 n.

44: 423 n.

46 ff.: 327 n.

50: 216 n.

53: 247 n.

Nem. 7: 321-3

21 ff.: 247 n.

34: 309

36 ff.: 313 n.

47: 217 n.

69: 408 n.

102-4: 322

 Σ 42-3: 208 Σ 46: 310 n. Σ 48: 321 n. Σ 64: 303, 321 n. Σ 86: 414 n. Σ 103: 321 n.*Nem.* 8:

13: 415 n.

20: 410 n.

50: 441 n.

Nem. 9:

25: 229 n.

Nem. 10:

15: 426 n.

33: 290 n.

49: 425

Nem. 11:

18: 221 n.

47: 320 n.

end: 210 n.

Humnoi:

fr. 29: 195 n.

fr. 30: 216

fr. 33a: 380 n.

fr. 33c-d: 370

fr. 33d: 251 n.

3: 250 n.

fr. 36: 354

- fr. 44. 1: 423 n.
 fr. 51b: 197
 fr. 51c: 155 n., 343 n.
 fr. 51d: 197
 fr. 57: 354 n., 429
- Huporkhemata:*
 fr. 107a: 100 n.
 fr. 107a-b: 267 n.
 fr. 108a and b: 194 n.
 fr. 112: 32 n.
- Paianes:*
 A1: 10, 117
 7: 435
 13: 235 n.
 13 ff.: 168
 36: 79 n.
 41: 397 n.
 41 ff.: 75 n.
 A2. 13: 404 n.
 A3: 24
 A4: 197
 B2: 10
 1: 74 n., 204 n.
 4: 397
 B4. 75: 168 n.
 C2:
 1 ff.: 74 n.
 10: 92 n.
 11 ff.: 369
 46: 168 n.
 D1: 37 n.
 7: 286 n.
 9-10: 75 n.
 D2: 46
 25: 168
 D3:
 10 ff.: 74 n.
 94: 79 n.
 D4: 381
 D5:
 41: 276
 43-8: 76 n.
 D6: 414 n.
 1: 74, 178 n.
 2: 204 n.
 13: 428
 51 ff.: 422
 54: 221 n.
 62: 170
 68: 173
 97: 222 n.
 112 ff.: 169
 115: 309 n.
 121-2: 72, 424 n.
 123: 168, 169
 137-8: 276
 139: 196 n.
 181-3: 76 n.
 D7. 11: 79 n., 424
 D14: 321 n.
 E1: 142, 254 n.
 9: 174
 F1: 137 n.
 F4: 149 n.
 F6: 79 n.
 F9: 80-1
 G1:
 11: 44 n., 375
 14: 168
 16: 325 n.
 19: 71 n.
 G6. 4: 71 n.
 G9. 3: 79 n.
 7: 145 n.
 G10. 4: 290 n.
 H1: 173
- Partheneia:*
 fr. 94b:
 2. 67: 202 n.
 31: 221 n.
 46: 197 n.
 fr. 94c. 3: 296 n.
- Prosodia:*
 fr. 89a: 195 n.
 fr. 89b: 416
 fr. 91: 352
- Threnoi:*
 fr. 128c: 23, 146
- uncertain genre:
 fr. 144: 366 n.
 fr. 150: 307 n.
 fr. 155: 366 n.
 fr. 169a. 6 ff.: 426 n.
 fr. 193: 180
 fr. 196: 344
 fr. 199. 3: 277 n.
 fr. 201: 352
 fr. 249b: 358, 404 n.
 fr. 263: 359 n.
 fr. 267: 352
 fr. 294: 420
 fr. 316: 265 n.
 fr. 338 (?): 168 n.
 S5. 18: 425
 S8: 354 n.
 7: 313 n.

Pindar, uncertain genre (*cont.*):

9: 80 n.

Z3: 341 n.

Z9: 195 n.

uncertain authorship:

fr. 249a Schr: 204 n.

*Vitae:**Vit. Ambr.:*

2. 2: 65 n., 180 n.

2. 14: 179 n.

2. 19: 180 n.

3. 6: 147 n.

3. 18: 325 n.

Vit. Thom. 7. 14: 146 n.

Plato:

Apol. 41 A: 416 n.[*Axiochus*] 365 B: 55*Critias:*

108 C: 72 n.

111 B: 286 n.

Ep. 348 B: 44 n.*Euthydemus* 289 B: 328 n.*Gorg.* 524 A 416 n.*Hipp. Maj.* 283 C: 290 n.*Ion* 534 D: 28 n., 460*Lach.* 188 D: 80 n.*Laws:*

2, 664 C: 63 n.

2, 666 E: 328

3, 700 D: 4, 98 n., 113

4, 724 B: 328 n.

8, 840 D: 223 n.

10, 890 E: 423 n.

12, 945 E: 198 n.

Phaedo:

58 A-C: 298 n.

60 C-D: 91

Phaedrus:

229 E: 290 n.

238 A: 428 n.

245 A: 144 n., 248

Phil. 66 D: 50 n.*Rep.:*

3, 394 C: 98 n.

398 E: 80 n., 384

4, 427 C: 395 n.

10, 607 A 4: 92 n.

608 C: 408 n.

Sump.:

177 A: 48 n.

Σ 177 A: 153 n.

Pliny the Elder:

2. 12. 54: 190

4. 11. 50: 271

Plutarch:

*Lives:**Aem.* 34: 45 n., 58 n.*Aratus* 53: 49*Flaminius* 16. 6. 2: 21 n.*Lysander* 18: 28 n., 58 n.*Mar.* 20: 45 n.*Marc.:*

8: 45 n., 58 n.

22: 47, 71 n.

Nicias 3. 4: 64*Them.* 8. 1: 44 n.*Theseus:*

22. 3: 136 n.

23. 1: 297-8

*Moralia:**Consol. Apoll.* 109 A: 223*De def. or.* 409 E: 395*De E ap. Delphos:*

389 A-B: 82

394 C: 79 n.

De exil.:

602 F: 281

605 D: 285 n.

De facie in orbe lunae 931 E: 190,

193

[*De fluv.*] 5. 2: 54 n.*De garrulitate* 511 B: 144[*De mus.*]:

1133: 104 n.

1134 C: 90, 383

1134 E: 98 n.

1134 F: 82 n.

1135 F: 91

1136 C: 360

1136 F: 80 n.

1140 E: 409 n.

1142 B-C: 25 n.

1143 B: 77 n.

1147 A: 50

De ser. num. vind.:

557 E-F: 310 n.

557 F: 179

Pyth. orac. 402 C-D: 460*Qu. Gr.:*

293 C: 202 n.

293 D: 332 n.

293 F-294 A: 429 n.

297 B 1 ff.: 429 n.

Soll. anim. 984 B-C: 383*Sump. probl.:*

1, 615 B: 51

- 7, 704 F: 383
 7, 713 A: 71 n., 79
 9, 741 A: 29 n.
- Polemo Periegetes:
 fr. 36: 310
 fr. 76: 49 n., 466
 fr. 78: 297 n.
- Pollux, *Onom.*:
 1. 38: 23 n.
 4. 65: 384 n.
 66: 103 n.
 79: 360
 81: 80 n.
 84: 26 n.
 6. 100: 50 n.
 8. 107: 298 n.
- Polybius:
 2. 29. 6: 19 n.
 4. 20. 8: 48-9 n.
- Porphyry:
De abst.:
 2.18: 28 n.
 2. 27: 256 n.
Vit. Pyth.:
 32: 54 n., 80 n.
 34: 54 n.
- Pratinas: 146
PMG 708: 100
PMG 712a: 267 n.
PMG 712 (b): 385 n.
PMG 713 (ii): 99
PMG 713 (iii): 25, 460
- Presocratics:
 Empedocles A 23: 198 n.
 Heraclitus B 93: 235 n.
 Parmenides A 20: 198 n.
- Proclus:
Chrest.:
 319 B 35 ff.: 362
 320 A:
 3-6: 362
 18 ff.: 105 n.
 21-5: 37 n., 48 n., 84, 104, 161 n.
 24-5: 90
 320 B 5 ff: 102
 320 B 21 ff: 102
 321 B 32 ff.: 201 n., 354, 429
Peri Aithiopidos: 312 n.
- Pseudo-Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi*:
 198 n.
 29: 218 n.
- Quintus Smyrnaeus 12. 441: 124 n.
- Sappho:
 16: 286 n.
 21: 2, 328 n.
 44:
 31-3: 14, 20 n., 56, 72, 125, 319
 32: 11 n.
 44a (?) 2: 250 n.
 53: 277
 103. 8: 277 n.
 107. 7: 287 n.
 116: 361
 128: 277 n.
 208: 278
 227: 449
SLG 291 (?): 11 n.
- Sarapion: 39 n., 42
- Silius Italicus, 3. 675-91: 352 n.
- Simonides:
PMG 519:
 fr. 32: 32, 75 n., 167 n., 460
 fr. 35 (a) 7: 341
 fr. 35 (b):
 4: 296 n.
 6: 250 n.
 7: 341 n.
 8: 173 n.
 9-10: 54 n., 66 n., 72
 10: 170 n., 325 n.
 12: 151
 12-13: 28
 fr. 37: 341 n.
 fr. 41: 78, 435
 fr. 55: 72, 460
 fr. 78 col. i. 10: 255 n.
 fr. 120 (b) 6. 19: 76 n.
- PMG* 542: 375 n.
PMG 543: 194 n.
PMG 570: 460
PMG 573: 28, 395, 460
PMG: 575. 1: 345 n.
PMG 577: 174 n., 460
PMG 578: 278 n., 460
PMG 582. 2: 404 n.
PMG 591: 286 n.
PMG 771: 71 n.
παίâves: 460
παίâves, προσόδια, παρθένεια: 80
- Solon: 297
IEG:
 13. 57: 11 n.
 13. 2: 310
 19. 2: 196 n.

Sophocles:

- παῖδες: 460
 παῖδν to Asklepios: 39, 79, 145
 1: 76 n.
 1-2: 74 n.
 2: 66
 παῖδν to sleep (*Phil.* 827 ff.): 110

tragedies:

Ajax:

- 17: 273 n.
 179: 264 n.
 694: 12 n., 71

Ant.:

- 100 ff.: 110, 144 n., 199
 492: 328 n.
 820: 408 n.
 1115: 428 n.
 1115 ff.: 132 n., 273 n.

OC:

- 689-90: 286 n.
 1180: 366 n.
 Σ 1047: 298 n.

OT: 134 n.

- 150 14
 151 ff.: 32 n., 36
 154: 70, 295
 171: 308 n.
 174: 70 n.
 184: 121
 215: 76 n.
 463: 341 n.
 504 ff.: 351 n.
 539: 308 n.
 1096: 37 n., 71 n.

Phil.:

- 827 ff.: 76 n., 109, 449
 831: 76 n.

Trakh.

- 172: 354 n.
 205 ff.: 133
 216 ff.: 79 n.
 Σ 172: 351
 Σ 216: 113 n.

TrGF iv:

- fr. 5 (*Athamas*): 404 n.
 fr. 425 (*Nauplius*): 50 n.
 fr. 523 (*Polyxena*): 50, 76 n.,
 121, 397 n.
 fr. 639: 375 n.
 fr. 710 (*Phineus*): 111 n.
 fr. 776: 326 n.

Statius, *Theb.*:

4. 153: 115 n.

8. 224: 32

10. 306: 32, 124 n.

Stephanus of Byzantium, *Eth.*:

223. 12: 65 n.
 226. 6: 266 n.
 248. 13: 429 n.
 602. 4: 239

Stesichorus

- παῖδες: 45 n.

- PMG* 198: 237 n.

- PMG* 212: 54, 277 n., 459

- PMG* 271: 193

- PMGF* 222 (b): 147 n.

- PMGF* S 27: 143 n.

- PMGF* S 27, col. ii. 6: 140 n.

- PMGF* S 133, col. ii. 9: 140 n.

- POxy* 3876, fr. 1. 5: 195 n.

Strabo

2. 3. 20, 549: 271

3:

4. 17, 165: 404 n.
 18, 165: 44 n., 45 n.

7:

7. 10, 328: 428 n.
 11, 329: 353 n.
 fr. 1: 429 n.
 fr. 1a: 353-4 n.
 fr. 40: 44

8:

4. 4, 360: 291
 7. 1, 383: 298 n.

9:

2. 4, 402: 429 n.
 33, 412: 197
 34, 413: 343
 3. 2, 422: 25 n., 26
 5, 419: 229 n.
 6, 419: 393
 9, 421: 212, 232
 10, 421: 27, 59, 71 n., 9-
 12, 422: 71 n., 202 n.
 5. 20-2, 441-2: 429 n.

10:

2. 17, 457: 271
 4. 16, 481: 25 n., 78 n.
 18, 481: 31 n., 460
 5. 6, 486: 291

12. 3. 20, 549: 263 n.

14:

1. 3, 633: 268
 30, 644: 271

15. 1. 57, 711: 460

16. 4. 13, 773: 44 n.

Suda:

- 1. 172. 2: 271 n.
- 385. 19: 54 n., 66 n.
- 2. 53. 10: 123 n.
- 303. 1: 123-4
- 4. 73. 26-7: 53 n., 153 n.
- 133. 6 ff.: 147 n.
- 402. 2: 39 n.

Synesius: 328

Telestes, *Asklepios* 384, 462

Terentianus Maurus: 19 n.

Theocles, *Ithyphallus* (CA 172): 412

Theocritus:

- 1. 32: 221 n.
- 5. 110-11: 385 n.
- 17. 64: 20 n.
- 18. 22: 375 n.
- 24. 25: 401 n.

Theognis:

- 809-10: 178 n.

[Theognis]:

- 776 ff.: 54 n., 65 n.
- 778: 80 n.

Thucydides:

- 2. 91. 2: 45 n., 123 n.
- 3. 104: 297
- 4. 43: 71 n.
- 96: 71 n.
- 5. 79. 4: 306 n.
- 6. 2: 380 n.
- 3. 1: 65 n.
- 32: 43 n., 53 n., 71 n., 123
- 7. 44: 44, 166 n.
- 57. 4: 295
- 75. 7: 71 n., 123
- Σ 1. 50: 43 n.
- Σ 4. 43: 43 n., 153 n.

Timotheus:

Persai: 103

196 ff.: 72, 121-2

205: 70

PMG 778 (b): 421 n.

PMG 800: 461

3: 173 n.

Tryphiodorus:

340ff: 124 n.

635: 313 n.

Tynnichus of Chalcis: 4, 28, 460

Virgil:

Aen.:

- 2. 239: 124 n.
- 330-2: 313 n.
- 471-5: 320 n.
- 3. 126 ff.: 295 n.
- Σ 73: 368 n.
- Σ 486: 352 n.
- 6. 657: 55 n.
- 10. 738: 55 n.
- Σ 738: 12 n., 362
- Σ *Ecl.* 4. 10: 368 n.

Xen. Eph.: 5. 13 20 n.

Xenophon:

An.:

- 4. 3. 19: 20 n., 21 n., 43 n.
- 5. 2. 14: 43 n.
- 5. 14: 20 n.
- 6. 1. 11: 65 n., 66 n., 80 n.
- 5. 27: 20 n., 43 n.
- 7. 7. 3: 308 n.

Cyr.:

- 3. 2. 11: 375 n.
- 3. 58: 43 n., 66 n.
- 3. 59: 22 n.
- 4. 1. 6: 66 n.
- 1. 7: 45 n.
- 6. 3. 6: 375 n.
- 3. 13: 375 n.
- 4. 12: 375 n.
- 7. 1. 9: 71 n.
- 1. 25: 66 n.

Hell.:

- 2. 4. 17: 43 n.
- 4. 5. 11: 30 n.
- 7. 4: 7, 36, 52, 95, 117
- 6. 3. 6: 380 n.
- 7. 2. 15: 45 n.
- 2. 23: 7, 52

Index of Subjects

- Abdera:
 Abderus, mythological founder 262
 and Apollo 265
 Derenus 267
 Hecate/Bendis 266
 Heroon of Abderus 267
 Molpoi 267
 sacred way 267
 Timesias, historical founder 262
- Achilles:
 and sack of Troy 160
 context obscure 421
 death of 311
 ghost of 50
- Aegina 375, 439
 abduction by Zeus 325
 Aiakeion 414
 Asopian Fountain 416
 hypothetical agreement with Delphi 335
 Mt. Hellanicus 415
 Thearion 144, 334
 visited by Argonauts 411 n.
- Aenianes:
 migrations 429
θεωρία to Delphi 175
- aetiology:
 aetiological back-formation 13, 346
 aetiological myth 405
 aetiological narrative 155
 and Aiakeia 411 n.
 as theme for *παιῶνες* 98
 common aetiology: of Delphic Theoxenia and Aeginetan myth of Zeus Hellanios 332–3; of Dodona and Ammon 352
 evolutionary cult 230
 of Ammon 353
 of cult of Apollo: at Delphi 228; in Paros 382
 of Artemis Tauropolos 405
 of Delphic Theoxenia 173, 178, 307
 of metre 79
 of name 'Teneric' 197
 of *παιῶν*-cry according to Limenios 345 n.
 Pythoctionia 18 n., 20 n., 25, 130, 168, 318 n.
- African oral literature 10
- Agemon, *παιῶν* to 49
- Agenor of Mytilene 146
- Aiakeia 415
- Aiakidai 172
 and Aegina 414
 conflict with Apollo 312
- Aiakos 335, 411, 438
 Aeginetan Aiakeia 411
 and the drought 326, 331–2
 as arbitrator among gods 326
 as judge of underworld 416
 return of from Troy 415
 statue of 414
- ἀλαλαί* 20, 43
- Alcaeus, ancient editions 147
- allusion:
 in Sappho 125
 Pindaric allusion: to Hesiod 250; to folk etymology of 'Delos' 251, 371
 Platonic 249
 position of 319
 to Pythoctionia aetiology 168
 in Greek tragedy 109
- ambiguity:
 in Pindar, *Nem.* 7: 321
 in status of Heracles 115 n., 410 n.
 of word *ΙΗΙΕ* 70 n.
 of word *παιῶν* 13
 paeanic 56, 99, 115, 171, 220, 319
- Aegiale 60
- Anacreon, ancient edition 147
- ancient edition of Pindar 158
- Andros:
 as Athenian foundation 295
 Simonidean *παιῶν* for 28, 333
θεωρία to Delphi 33, 335

animals:

dogs 43, 54 n.

dolphins 386

horses 43, 269

Antigonos Monophthalmus 57 n., 96

Aphrodite 266, 307

and libations at symposium 96

and statue-carrying rituals 405

Apollo:

Archegetes 296, 380

Delios 65

Delphinios 61, 387

Derenos 265

Eikadios 206

Galaxios 179 n.

Hekatos 28

Ieios 13

Karneios 31, 355

Kastalios 206

Maleatas 41

Ptoieus/Ptoios 343

Puthaieus 31

Puthios 335

Thearios 334 n.

Apolline ethics 320

birth of 367

duplicious nature of 122

epiphanies of 278

etymology 16

identification with Helios 198

low profile in Pindar's Paianes 160

Near Eastern influence 16

syncretism with Paiawon 16

Apollonius δ εἰδογράφος 101

ἀποστεπτικὸν ἄσμα 53 n.

apotropaic prayer 7

appealing to Paian 63, 72 n.

Aratus of Sicyon 49, 57

Ares, παῖάν to 43

Ariphron:

and Hermias-song 96

idea of dependence on gods 351 n.

metre: 79

Aristonoos, role of Athena 133

Artemis:

and Apollo 23

and Hecate 272

and moon 368

and Spartan Gumnopaidia 31

birth of 368

cult song to 411

ἵπποσά 435

in Greek tragedy 111

ὄρειδρόμος 341

Asclepius:

and Aelius Aristides 38

and Aigle 110

and Alcestis story 121, 396

and title Paian 11

cult at Athens 39

Erythraean παῖάν to 39

introduction of into Greece 17

Mounikhios 61 n.

παῖανισταί of at Athens 60

syncretism with Heracles 136

Asine:

and Argos 62

cult of Apollo Pythaeus 31

Asteria 250-1, 324, 366, 371

Athena:

and Asclepius 42

and Hephaestus 217

and statue-carrying 404

in Aristonoos, παῖάν 29

Khalkioikos 226

παῖāves in honour of 47

Pronoia 221, 298, 367

quarrelled with Apollo 309

other 421

Athenaios, music 81

Athens:

Aiakeion 415 n.

and Delos 295, 297, 368

as colonizer of Cyclades 295

as founder of Teos 268

context unclear 97

cult of Asclepius 39

journey of Apollo to 35

παῖανισταί of Asclepius 60

Panathenaia 47

performance of παῖāves at 32

route from Delphi to 65 n.

temple of Delian Apollo 60

θεωρία to Delphi 33

other 97, 345

ἀπέλλα 16

Babylonians:

Creation Epic 217

image of temple as bird 226

ritual on occasion of the eclipse of
the moon 192

Shamash-shum-ukin 192 n.

Bacchylides:

generic dimensions of 75, 324

opening 28 n.

- Bacchylides (*cont.*):
 arrangement of books 158
 titles 150
- birds:
 cock 54 n.
 eagle 219, 394
 halcyon 359
 quail 252 n.
 swan 278
 wryneck 232
- βῶρυμος*/Bormos 12
- Cairns, F. 307 n.
 Calame, C. 62
 Callisthenes of Olynthus 95
 canon 4, 107, 126–7
- Ceos:
 Athenian foundation 295
 Ayia Irini 289
 founders of Ceian cities 291
 Karthaia 283
 links to Delos 284
 myths 288, 291
- chariot:
 in ritual 414
 of poetry 266, 374
 of Sun 194
 of swans 278
- Chrysothemis of Crete 103, 205
- chthonic sphere:
 and Apollo's take-over of Delphi 397
 and River Peneius 203
 and Typhon 396
 chthonic deities at symposium 50
 engagement of *παῖάν* with 49
- closure:
 and *παῖάν*-cry 48
 and refrain 72
 unemphatic 296
- Coleridge, S. T. 72 n.
- colonization:
 Delphi as advocate of 178
 of Abdera 262, 270
 of Cyclades 295
 of Cyrene 412
 of Delos 296
 of Euboea 295
 role of Apollo Archegetes 296, 380
 commission of songs 167, 177, 181, 285
 compensation, generic 128
 compensatory supplement 336–7
- Crete:
 and Delphi 24, 206
 and *παῖάν* 15, 77
 renunciation of by Euxantius 290
- Cyrene:
 and Ammon 352
 and the Antenoridai 413
 Karneia 31, 167
 sacred law 243
- D'Alessio, G. B. 148 n., 210, 248, 269, 327 n., 328, 451 n., 454 n.
- dance:
 and Greek tragedy 111
 and imitation of animals 387
 and Orkhestai 60
 and *παῖάν* performance 65, 85
 and Pan 12 n.
 at Spartan Huakinthia 31
 obscure reference 421
- date:
 of A1: 192
 of B2: 231
 of D2: 274
 of D4: 284
 of D6: 331
- dawn 54
- Deliades 29, 60 n.
- Deliastai, Athenian 60, 297
- Delos 246, 274
 and myth of birth of Apollo 368
 folk-etymology of name 251, 371
 Ionian settlement of 295
 Letoon 226
 links with Ceos 284
 Monument of Hexagons 226
παῖάν performance there 29
 storage of texts at 144
θεωροί to 35, 64
ὑπόρχημα and 100
- Delphi 391
 Alcmaeonid temple 230
 anonymous Delphic songs 77
 Apollo's take-over of 396
 as earth's navel 393
 as site for performance of *παῖάνες* 24
 cult of Muses 174 n.
 cult of Neoptolemus 314
 Delphic dragon 25
 Delphic maxims 210
 Delphic wisdom 172
 Dionysus at 133
 Herois 408

- Labyadae 133
 myth of the four temples 214
 Poseidon 29 n.
 Septerion 29, 112, 225
 founding of? 204
 Sixth Temple 132
 Themis/θέμις 216, 397
 θεωρία to 33
 treaty with Skiathos 310
 winged Sphinx of Naxians 219
 Delphinion 61, 85
 Demeter:
 at Hermione 308
 βασιλεία 404
 Demetrius Poliorcetes 57 n., 96
 Diagoras of Melos 123
 dialect:
 and authenticity 238, 462
 and word *παῖαν* 11
 in C1: 243
 of Pindar's Paianes 168
 Didyma:
 and Callimachus 127
 and Molpoi 32, 63
 Didymus:
 and Proclus 106 n.
 as editor of Pindar 137 n., 148–9,
 150, 355–7, 380, 431
 commentary on Demosthenes 93 n.
 Diomedes 101
 Dionysius Iambus 360
 Dionysius of Phaselis 98
 Dionysius the Elder, tyrant of Syracuse
 335
 Dionysus:
 Abdera and 266
 as symbol of transgression 87
 Attic tragedy and 113
 Delphi and 77, 133
 Dithurambos 12
 διθύραμβος and 113
 festivals of 99
 in D4: 287
 ivy and 113
 musical disorder and 83
 Orpheus and 198
 sphere of 421
 statue-carrying and 31 n., 416
 syncretism with Apollo 133
διθύραμβος/Dithurambos
 and Dionysus 113
 and *παῖαν* 75, 88, 134
 and *POxy* 2368: 237
 name of genre as epithet 12
 two types of 9
 Dodona:
 and S8: 428
 and Theban Tripodephoria 354
 as performance scenario for Pindaric
 παῖαν 166
 common aetiology with Ammon
 352
 foundation of 428
 dubious Paianes 139, 162
 eclipse 192
 Egypt:
 Amun-Ra 223, 352
 architects Suti and Her 223
 architecture 219
 copy of Erythraean *παῖαν* found
 there 39
 Egyptian etymology of *παῖαν* 14
 Egyptian hymns 10, 74
 Horus 256
 myth of creation 218
 παιανισταί of Sarapis 61
 Pindar's attitude to 352
 popularity of *παῖαν* in Hellenistic
 and Roman period 138
 Thebes 352
 victory stele of Merneptah 257
 eidography, Hellenistic 152
 Eikadios 24, 206
ἐγκώμιον/Enkomion 92
ἐπινίκιον/Epinikion:
 arrangement in Hellenistic edition
 159
 implication of first person 68
 metre 78, 448
 performance 66
 size of triad 74
 Electryon 165, 425, 426
 Eniautos 255
 Enualios 14, 43, 85, 264 n.
ἐφηβοί 47, 58, 334
 Ephesus 460
 and birth of Apollo 32
 Epic Cycle:
 Aithiopis 312
 Iliou Persis 313
 epichoric, local variation 10
 Epidauros, cult hymns 42, 144
 Epidaurian version of birth of Ascle-
 pius 41
 Hymn to Pan 71

- Epidaurian Asclepius myth (*cont.*):
 Isyllus, *παῖδν* 145
 epiphany 74, 121, 160, 412
 birth as 368
 of Apollo 277
 epithets in *παῖδν* 76, 169
 Dionysiac epithets 132
εὐαίων 110
κλυτόμαντις 204
πατρῶος 250
 Erythraean *παῖδνες*:
 to Apollo: introduction 21; refrain 70
 to Asclepius 39; and *Automatisierung* 129 n.; metre 449; refrain 70, 317
 to Seleukos 57 n.: metre 79
 etymology:
 folk-etymology 25: of 'Delos' 251;
 of *ἐνιαυτός* 256 n.
 of name *Paiawon* 14
 Euboea:
 Aegae 197
 Chalcis 295
 Eretria 295
 laurel temple 225
 Euhemerization 26, 202
 Euripides:
 and Orkhestai 60
Ba., conflict in 83
 Euros, Spartan *παῖδν* to 46 n., 70 n.
 Eustathius Macrembolites 55 n.
 Euxantius 172
- Fairbanks, A. 13 n., 29 n., 53 n., 84
 festivals:
 Aeginetan 411
 as context for celebration of victory 46
 Athenian 256
 fictitious 118
 sacred time 285
 statue-carrying 404
 five:
 five stones in foundation of Delphic temple 225 n.
 symbolism of 77
 framing 111
 genre:
Automatisierung 129 n.
 concepts of 4
 generic allusion as compensation 128
 generic archaeology 10
 generic canon 4
 generic signature 72, 113, 246
- handwriting:
 capitals 140, 149, 419
 semicursive 149, 164–5, 434
 Harvey, A. E. 8
 healing 37
 Hecate:
 at Abdera 174, 266, 272
 in Molpoi inscription 49, 63
 mysteries of 54 n.
 Helios 256
 Hephaestion 158 n.
 Hera 404
 and Samian Tonaia 404
 mother of Typhon 396
 persecutes Leto 367
 quarrelled with Apollo 309
 sends Halcyon 359
 Heracles:
 ambiguity in status of 409
 and Abderus 265
 as addressee of *παῖδνες* 136
 birth of 401, 426
 and Erginus 223
 and Greek tragedy 114, 120: Kallinikos 382
 and Paros 380–1
 and Pindar 171, 251
 Hermes 50 n., 55, 63, 117
 heroes:
 and Delphi 24, 206, 314–15
 and Delos 246
 and Didyma 64
 and Sparta 31
 and *παῖδν* 49, 50, 57, 75, 118–19, 155, 161, 164, 362–3
 and *προσόδιον* 417–18
 and songs of Xenocritus 99–100, 383
 eponymous heroes of genres 12
 specific heroes: Abderus 262, 264–5, 274; Agemon 29 n., 49; Aiaikos 326, 411–18; Electryon 425; Euxantios 289–92; Malos 41; Ptoios 343; Tenerus 196–7; unknown 375, 408, 421
 hieros gamos 413
 history of the text 144

- Hittites 10
 Hoekstra, A. 333
 Homer, reminiscences of 168, 366
Homeric Hymns:
 Apollo, Delian: relation to C2: 252;
 to G1: 367
 introductory formulas 74
 Pythian, use of name 'Paieon' 12
 Homeridai 386
 Horai 255
 hypomnema 149, 389
 Hyperboreans:
 Apollo returns from 28, 38
 in Simonides 460
 temple of Apollo flies to 217
 visited by Apollo 27, 278
 iconography:
 Aiakos and Greek leaders 415
 birds and ὀμφαλός 394
 Delphic Sphinx 219
 epiphany of Apollo 279 n.
 infant Heracles 401
 of Pythoetonia 27
 on Delphi temple 135
 statue of Ammon by Calamis 353
 ἰδίωμα, παϊανικόν 94, 153
 ἰάλεμος/Ialemos 12
 India:
 Atharvaveda 10
 Rgveda 25
 Sanskrit 14
 Tamil poetry 10
 initiation 8, 62
 iobakkhos 13 n.
 ἰούλος/Iouulos 12
 Isis 342
 Isyllos:
 account of birth of Asclepius 203
 dedication 145
 metre 79
 refrain 70
 καλλίνικος 136, 386
 Käppel, L. 84, 134, 288
 Kastalios 205, 206
 Kharites 277, 307, 342, 366
 khoros:
 and παϊάν performance 59
 and Plato's *Laws* 63
 and procession 64
 and θεωρία 64
 Deliades 29
 female khoros as symbol 274
 impersonating animals 387
 in Spartan Huakinthia 30
 khoros-leader 68
 referred to in song 196, 247, 266
 Kurke, L. 316
 κῶμος 66, 307, 441
 labour, sacred 112, 248, 309
 Lade, battle of 263
 Laomedon 382
 length:
 of rolls 142-3 n., 152, 161-2
 of stanzas 167, 448
 of poems 189; 214-16; 252; 276-7;
 379
 of kola 78
 Leto:
 and birth of Apollo 367
 and Gumnopaidia 31
 and Pythoetonia 25
 Delian Letoon 226
 other 277, 404
 light:
 birth of Apollo and Artemis and
 367
 sun as a source of 194
 victory described in terms of 271
 Limenios:
 music 81
 size of triad 74
 λιτιέρσης/Lityerses 12
 λινός/Linos 12
 local vs. panhellenic:
 local communities 67
 local cults 290
 local nymphs of Delos 369
 local songs 31, 416
 Macedonicus:
 dedication 145
 metre 79
 Melampus 133, 173, 287
 Melanippides and Lydian harmonia
 360
 metre 443
 ancient colometry 146
 variations in 443
 arrangement of songs based on 158
 cretic 76, 100
 cretic-paeonic 25
 dactylo-epitrite 294
 epiploke 447

- metre (*cont.*):
 iambic 357
 of *παῖνες* 76–9
 of Pindar's Paianes 448
παίων as a metrical term 11, 76
 paroemiac 15 n.
- Miletus 60–2; 291
- mimesis:
 and *ὑπόρχημα* 101, 156
 Delphic Septerion as 202
 musical 82: of gods in ritual 175;
 of myth in ritual 175; of myth
 in song 174; of performance
 scenario 128, 178
 poetic 42
- Minos 288, 380, 414
- Molpoi:
 Abderite (?) 267
 Milesian 22, 32, 60
 and Callimachus 128
 role of Onitadai 292
 of Aegiale on Amorgos 60
 Olbian 60
- monostrophic structure 167, 176, 294,
 406
- mountains:
 at the Ptoion 343
 centre of earth as 394
 Delphic 82
 Mt. Athos 270
 Mt. Cynthus 366, 374
 Mt. Garizim 394
 Mt. Helicon 279
 Mt. Hellanicus 416
 Mt. Ida 313, 366
 Mt. Melamphyllon, battle of 271
 Mt. Meru 394
 Mt. Phikion 196
 Mt. Tantalus in Lesbos 239
- Muses:
 cult at Thespiæ 279
 in Philodamus' *παῖαν* 134
 invocation of 74
 Kleo 243
 nine 365
 Pierides 434
 possession of 328
 question addressed to 218, 309
- music 80
 harmoniai 80: Aeolian 81, 384; Do-
 rian 80; Hypodorian 384; Hy-
 pophrygian 384; Ionian 384;
 Locrian 82, 383; Lydian 81
- notation 81
 Puthikos Nomos 26
 Spondeion 82
- musical instruments:
 aulos 30, 80, 279, 358
 kithara 28, 30, 59, 80, 135
- Mycenean tablets 11, 16, 25
- mythological paradigm 285, 315
- Nagy, G. 68 n., 125, 446
- narrative 75, 192, 214, 313, 380
 Apolline 98
 narrative song = *διθύραμβος* 28
- Naxos:
 Athenian foundation 295
 Sphinx dedicated at Delphi 219
θεωρία to Delos 366
- Naxos, Sicilian 64
- νέοι* 58, 334
- Neoptolemus 179, 313
- Nicias 64, 298
- Nietzsche, F. 87
- Niobe:
 grief of 49, 121 n.
 hears *παῖαν* 122
 wedding of 56, 81, 360, 420
- νόμος* 26, 128, 384
- ὀλολυγή* 19, 85
 crossed with *παῖαν* 48
- ὀμφαλός*, Delphic 178, 393
- Olympus of Lydia 81, 82, 361
- openings 52, 74–5, 307, 423
- Orkhestai 60
- Orpheus 133 n., 198
- oxymoron 120, 369, 409
- paeanic ambiguity 115, 319
- Paenians 14, 43, 116
 and Abdera 270
- παιανισταί* 39
- παῖαν*-cry:
 aetiology of 319
 and battle 43
 and closure 48
 as endorsement 71
 as response to illness 38
 uttered by Echo 35
- Paiawon 11, 15, 17, 25, 43, 68
- Pan:
 and Pindar 65, 180
 as singer of *παῖνες* 59
 identical to Paian? 12

- invocation of similar to *παῖάν*-cry 71
 panhellenic:
 contests 286
 Delphic Theoxenia as a panhellenic festival 310
 perspective 181, 273
 song 31
παράγραφος 139; 185; 212; 275; 340;
 372; 388-9; 420-1
 paronomasia, sacred 318
 Paros 290
 Athenian *θεωρία* to 382
 attacked by Heracles 380
 Delion 367, 381
παρθένειον/Partheneion 389
 eidography of 156
 κεχωρισμένα παρθένεια 417
 performance:
 effects of 273
 modes of 63
 original 334
 performance scenarios 166
 split performance 337
 Philodamus:
 and dedication of sixth temple at Delphi 230
 as example of generic syncretism 132
 Pindar:
 ancient edition 137: order of books 147
 Dithuramboi, titles 151 n.
 Epinikia:
 Ol. 1: end 410; stanza length 167 n.
 Ol. 10: metre 449
 Pyth. 2: metre 449 n.
 Pyth. 4: stanza length 167 n.
 Pyth. 10: title 151 n.
 Isthm. 7: metre 455
 Isthm. 8: stanza length 167 n.
 Nem. 3: stanza length 167 n.
 Nem. 6: metre 449 n.
 Paianes: A1 (metre) 448; G1 (style) 169
 polis:
 bipolar relationship with local sanctuary 62, 265
 role of Apollo in 61
 Poseidon:
 and Aiakos 415
 and Pelops 431
 and Tenerus 197
 libation to 51
 mares of 411
 παῖάν to 36, 52
 race of=horses 269
 son of Kronos 220
 temple of in Atlantis 226
 projection, choral 114
 prophecy:
 aetiological 404
 and *παῖάν* 173
 and poetry 174
 by Hecate 271
 by Heracles 171
 by Nereus 237
 by Themis 416 n.
 context obscure 347, 372
 duplicitous nature of Apollo's 125
 genealogical 203
 of Ge at Delphi 229
 prophets:
 Cassandra 235
 Melampus 287
 Tenerus 161, 197
 prophets as bridging Dionysiac and Apolline 133
 θέμις as prophetic ruling 397
 universal knowledge 221
 prosodion/*προσόδιον* 34-5, 105-7, 152,
 156 n., 284 n., 297, 306, 329-31, 365 n., 373, 399, 406, 417, 439-40
 προσοδιακὸς παῖάν 106, 284, 343 n.
 Ptolemais 39, 141 n.
 Pythagoras:
 Pythagorean number theory 77
 use of *παῖάν* by 38, 54
 Radt, S. 142, 265-6, 270, 272-3, 309, 313, 317, 318
 refrain:
 and structure 74
 as climax of triad 264
 composite refrain 136
 D2: 452
 generic properties of 98
 in *παῖάν* 21, 69
 in tragedy 112
 performance of 66
 quasi-refrain 70
 reconstructed 236, 355, 391
 syntax of 403
 ritually correct utterance (*εὐφημία*) 19, 53

- rivers:
 Asopus 325
 Ismenus 197
 Melas 358 n.
 Nestos 272
 Peneius 201, 397
 Phasis 54 n.
 Strymon 270
 Titaessus 202
- sacred way:
 at Abdera 267
 Delian 295
 Miletus to Didyma 32
- sacrifice 84, 254
 and Delphic Theoxenia 310
 and Neoptolemus 314
 as context for ritually correct utterance 19
 as metaphor for poetry 325 n.
 before battle 43
 Delian 366
 language 170
 song as 145
 theoxenia 289
 use of *παῖάν*-cry in 48
- Samos:
 Lusandreia 58
 Tonaia 404
- Sappho:
 arrangement of books 158, 449, 452
 book length 143 n.
 metre 446
- Sarapis:
παῖνες to 55
παῖανισταί of 61
- sea:
 -battle 45
καταποντισμός of Asteria 251
 statue taken to 404
- Simonides:
 arrangement of books 158
 death of 284
σκόλιον/Skolion 92, 96
- Sophocles:
παῖάν-singing after the battle of Salamis 45 n.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 224, 238
- Sparta:
 and *παῖάν* performance 30
 and reperformance 3
 and Thaletas of Gortyn 24, 37
 cult of Ammon at Gytheum 353
 Gumnopaidia 57, 85, 383
 Huakinthia 30, 49, 57
 Karneia 30, 31, 120
 Lysander-*παῖάν* 46, 58
 marching-*παῖάν* 44
παῖανίαι 60
παῖάν to Euros 46, 79
παῖάν to Poseidon 36, 52, 117
 Teleclus 291
 temple of Athena Khalkioikos 226
- speaking subject:
 in Aristonoos, *παῖάν* 29
 in Pindar 67, 175, 266, 307
- speech-frame 235, 273
- sphragis:
 poetic 104, 122, 410
 of Bacchylides 17: 73
 of citharodic *nomos* 104 n.
- Stehle, E. 272, 455
- Sumerians:
 Enheduanna, collector of Sumerian temple hymns 214
 epithet *umun duga zida* 340 n.
 Gudea of Lagash 226
 priestesses as doves 354 n.
 temple as bond of heaven and earth 394
 temple hymns 10, 214, 227
- symmetry between deity and worshipper 194
- syncretism 48
 between Apollo and Derainos 265
 between Apollo and Dionysus 133
 between Apollo and Paiawon 16
- syntax:
 asyndeton 72, 290
 exclamation governing accusative 317
 imperative mood 25 n., 172, 209, 318, 327
 passive voice 22, 169
 plural 196, 315
 singular reference of plural pronoun 196
- Telesphorus 42, 128, 465
- temples:
 Delphic temples, myth of 179, 216
 Delphinion 61
E-sag-ila, temple of Marduk at Babylon 217
 inauguration of Sixth Temple at Delphi 132

- of Delian Apollo at Athens 60
 Sumerian temple 394
 Sumerian temple hymns 10, 214, 227
 temple of Atargatis-Derketo at Hierapolis-Bambyke 217
 temple of Horus at Edfu 218
 Teos 268
 Teian Dirae 269
 textual signs:
 abbreviations 149
 asteriskos 139, 323-4, 330
 coronis 139-40, 185, 252, 388, 403
 scriptio plena 139
 τεχνίται Διονύου 34-5, 61, 412
 see also παράγραφος
 Thasos 263
 cult-inscription 131
 Thebes, Boeotian:
 and παιάν performance 32, 348, 356
 and Ptoion 343
 and Tenerus 196
 cult of Ammon 353
 Daphnephoria 201, 256
 Erginus and 223
 Ismenion 110, 175, 192, 356
 Thebageneis 356
 Tripodephoria 354, 429
θεωρία 33, 62
 Andrian to Delphi 33, 335
 Athenian to Delos 297
 Athenian to Delphi 33, 335
 Athenian to Paros 382
 Athenian to (?) 345
 Ceian to Delos 284
 from Naxos in Sicily 64
 Naxian to Delos 366
 three:
 khoroi in Plato 63
 libations at symposion 50, 171
 παιάν-cry repeated thrice 19 n., 79
 rising tricolon 194
 triple metrical structure in refrain of D2: 452
 types of songs performed at symposion 51
θρήνος/Threnos:
 and Aratus of Sicyon 49
 and Lydian harmonia 360
 contrast with παιάν 87, 122
 in Greek tragedy 119
 Olympus of Lydia 81
 Pindaric articulation of 23
 special types 12
 titles:
 and organization of songs in editions 158
 fragmentary 106, 150, 246, 284, 333, 377, 386, 439
 in ancient edition 150
 triumphus 46
 Trozen 408
 Ugaritic literature 227
ὑμέναιος/Hymenaeus 12
ῥυμος/Humnos 92
 Watkins, C. 15, 110 n.
 wedding:
 of Hector and Andromache 125
 of Niobe 81, 360
 of Peleus and Thetis 124, 327
 of Pelops and Hippodameia 431
 παιάν and 56
 other 413; 422
 wedding-gift 285, 431
 wedding-song 12
 women 38
 and birth of Apollo 368
 and ὀλολυγή 20, 48
 and performance of παιάνες 59, 85
 Cassandra and the παιάν 237
 in Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae* 53
 in Herodas 4: 41
 obscure context 421
 symbolism of female khoros 274
 Xenocritus of Locri 4, 73, 81, 90, 99, 101, 107, 145 n., 170, 383-7, 460
 Xenodamus of Cythera 90, 99-100, 101, 107, 146, 460
 Zeus:
 Ammon 174, 180, 352, 354
 Dodonaioi 429
 Hellanios 307, 415
 Herkeios 313
 Hupatos 381 n.
 Melosios 366 n.
 Nemeios 51
 Olumpios 50
 Paian 48
 Soter 50
 Xeiniios 220

Zeus (cont.):

abducts Aegina 325

addressed by Cassandra 236

providence of 366

role in destruction of Troy 312

temple at Olympia 219